

Samuil Zivs

The Anatomy of Lies



Progress Publishers
MOSCOW

001684/2

620

Translated from the Russian by *Nadezhda Burova*

Designed by *Gennady Gubanov*

Самуил Зивс

АНАТОМИЯ ЛЖИ

На английском языке

© Издательство «Юридическая литература», 1982

English translation of the revised Russian text

© Progress Publishers 1984

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

З 1201000000—626 без объявл.
014(01)—84

CONTENTS

WHY "THE ANATOMY OF LIES"? (in lieu of a foreword)	5
ON SOURCES AND METHODS	7
Born of Lies	7
Pounds ... and Pieces of Silver	9
The Samizdat Operation	15
Amnesty International and the 1980 Olympics	22
The Unholy Trinity: Amnesty International, Radio Liberty and Co.	25
Amnesty International's Guest Tour Agency	28
MISINFORMATION: THE WAY IT IS PRODUCED	35
Little Lies and Big Lies	35
Figure-Juggling	47
"All Religious Believers Are Persecuted"	50
Misinformation for the Sake of Provocation	62
WHO IS DEFENDED BY AMNESTY INTERNA- TIONAL AND WHO IS NOT?	67
The Mythical Engineer, Michael Haugk	67
"Pardon the Executioners!"	68
Amnesty International's Rules Do Not Apply to a Victim of Terror	78
A Peculiar Interpretation of History	83
Unbidden Advocates	94
Community of Beliefs	102
SPECIAL SUBJECTS	120
"Torture and Starvation" and Real Calories	120
"Hunger Strikes"	130
"Punitive Medicine": a Big Lie	137
Beware of the Emissaries of Lies	157

WHY "THE ANATOMY OF LIES"? (in lieu of a foreword)

When browsing the preface to the 1980 Amnesty International Report written by the chairperson of its International Executive Committee, the reader cannot fail to be struck by two circumstances. For one thing, the author clearly claims that Amnesty International has a special mission. He repeatedly refers to Amnesty International's "mandate", apparently infatuated with the phrase. But it is still not clear who granted the mandate.

The other circumstance is still more amazing. The author takes pains to prove that in its activity Amnesty International is a paragon of objectivity, trustworthiness, impartiality and independence. He claims that this is manifested in and best substantiated by the impartiality of Amnesty International's information. He is highly emotional when speaking about the organisation's "accuracy" in handling information.

The preface is followed by an "analytical survey" of Amnesty International's activities written by Martin Ennals who was its Secretary General for many years. In the survey, pretentiously entitled "Amnesty International in the Eighties", trouble is taken to further elaborate on the authenticity and impartiality of the information disseminated by Amnesty International. Ennals dwells upon the "accuracy" and the "careful use of the factual information" collect-

ed by the organisation. He makes no attempt to feign modesty and he is not shy about hailing the organisation's alleged "standards of accuracy and impartiality". "The collection and use of accurate information" have been listed among the "fundamental and central aspects" of Amnesty International's activity.

These categorical assertions made me recall my frequent encounters with Martin Ennals who has co-ordinated Amnesty International's activities over the past twelve years. I remember meeting some of those who were and still are in charge of Amnesty International's operations. I have known some of them for a long time and met them under various circumstances.

My colleagues and I have made every effort to convince—patiently, persistently and in a well-substantiated manner—the people working for Amnesty International that they get their information from the murky spring of falsehood. I argued that by wittingly collecting, processing and condensing misinformation, by formulating biased—as they have been soaked in the poison of slanderous primary material—generalisations and allegations on human rights in the USSR, Amnesty International is consciously instigating political confrontation rather than serving the cause of authenticity and impartiality.

When I heard Amnesty International's leaders blowing their own trumpet in this manner, I felt morally obliged to tell the public that, instead of practising impartiality and fostering accuracy, Amnesty International is deliberately and purposefully propagating partiality and inaccuracy or, to put it in everyday language, spilling lies.

That is why this book is called *The Anatomy of Lies*.

ON SOURCES AND METHODS

Born of Lies

Is there such a thing as an innate disposition to lie? Yes, there is. It is a kind of pathological craving for lying. It is a life-long passion that consumes the liar. It is a grave disease, which becomes utterly corrupting if one's entire career, one's entire existence are based on lies. In this case nothing can cure the liar because ... can the leopard change its spots?

If lies attend at the birth and sustain the life of an organisation, and especially if they are the main source of leverage for effecting its aims, this organisation is doomed to infamy.

Amnesty International was born some 20 years ago. It was born of lies, and since then they have invariably accompanied it.

May 28, 1961 is considered to be Amnesty International's date of birth. On that day, London's conservative newspaper *The Observer* published an article headlined "The Forgotten Prisoners". Its author Peter Benenson, a British lawyer, was later to hold the posts of Amnesty's Secretary and then President.

We got hold of a copy of *The Observer Weekend Review* of May 28, 1961 and examined Benenson's programmatic article. In those days, we found out, the target of his criticism in the Soviet Union was comradesly courts. Calling for a world campaign to urge governments to release "the forgotten prisoners", among them the "vic-

times" of Soviet comradely courts, the founder of Amnesty International wrote: "The so-called comradely courts in the USSR, which have power to deal with 'parasites', are in essence little more than departments of the Ministry of Labour, shifting 'square pegs' into empty holes in Siberia."

What should one start with in analysing information so hopelessly muddled?

First of all, comradely courts, set up in 1961, are bodies elected at enterprises and in neighbourhoods. They are not part of the judiciary. Their function is to promote the education of the citizens in the spirit of a responsible attitude to labour, socialist property, the rules of law and order, mutual comradely assistance, and respect for the dignity and honour of man.

In some cases anti-social misdemeanours, instead of being tried by regular courts of law, are considered by comradely courts. This is done when other forms of punishment are thought to be inadvisable and unnecessary. A person may be relieved of criminal responsibility, and the case transferred to a comradely court.

The Statute Governing the Comradely Courts (in its 1961 wording) provides for the following range of penalties: the obligation to apologise publicly; friendly caution; public censure; public reprimand (with or without publication in the press); cash fine (not more than 50 roubles).

Therefore, comradely courts were never entitled to deport "parasites", i.e. those who, instead of doing honest work for a living, sponge on others, to Siberia or elsewhere. Neither were they empowered to condemn to exile any categories of people at all.

Furthermore, comradely courts are not "departments of the Ministry of Labour" for the simple

reason that such a ministry, and especially one empowered to supply labour, or "pegs", as Benenson puts it, to "empty holes" in Siberia, does not exist—and never existed—in the Soviet Union.

Isn't this sufficient evidence that from an infant, so to speak, while taking its first steps, Amnesty International leaned heavily on falsehood?

Pounds ... and Pieces of Silver

In the first decade of Amnesty International's existence, its annual budget was scanty. In the fiscal year of 1969-70, it amounted to a mere £33,000. The then AI Treasurer, Anthony Marreco, dreamed of an income of £50,000 which could turn the organisation into "a really tremendous force".

However, as soon as Amnesty International disclosed its plan to publish a "report" on "the prisoners of conscience in the USSR", its budget swelled, as if by magic, to £250,000. By November 1975, when the first edition of the report appeared, it soared to £350,000, registering a tenfold rise in five years. The budget approved in September 1976 amounted to more than £750,000. In September 1977, Amnesty International's budget reached £829,000, and by 1980-81 it grew to £2,092,810.

To judge from Amnesty International's reports, it is largely dependent for its budget on its groups (which compose AI national sections in various countries), each making a contribution of £30 per annum to the International Secretariat.

The reports do not elucidate, however, how it could possibly happen that between 1970 and

1975 Amnesty's budget grew tenfold while the number of its groups increased by less than one-third.

This is, in fact, an enigma. How could the income soar without a corresponding growth in the number of national sections, groups and individual members?

In its published form, Amnesty's budget is certainly mystifying. However, there are materials available that can help explain the enigma of pounds ... and pieces of silver.

The US press published two very curious articles in which an attempt is made to estimate the effectiveness of methods involved in sustaining the human rights campaign and to outline the US Administration's goals in it. There is no need to speak in detail, here and now, about the campaign against the alleged violations of human rights in the USSR and other socialist countries being used to effect selfish political and ideological aims and to interfere in the socialist countries' internal affairs, about its being aimed at disrupting the positive processes in international relations and poisoning the atmosphere of detente and mutual understanding.

One of the articles was written by Dante Fascell. At the time of its writing Fascell, a Democratic congressman, was chairman of the US Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and a most vigorous proponent of the US Administration's policy in the human rights area. In his article, entitled "Did Human Rights Survive Belgrade?" (see *Foreign Policy*, No. 31, 1978), Fascell specifies the US strategy in exploiting the human rights issue as a means of fostering foreign-policy confrontation.

The reader cannot fail to notice that Fascell's recommendations include greater reliance on in-

ternational non-governmental organisations in effectuating the US Administration's policy. Among the organisations "to play an important role" Fascell mentions Amnesty International and the World Jewish Congress.

The comparison of Fascell's recommendations with the ideas set forth in a similarly prognostic article by Denis Gullet of the Overseas Development Council places Amnesty International's role in strong relief. Gullet stresses the importance of a broad understanding of human rights and analyses the ways of enhancing the efficiency of the notorious human rights campaign. He is compelled to indirectly recognise that the world public is becoming increasingly aware of the true meaning of the US Administration's human rights posture. He notes that the latter is rendered inconsistent by the US geopolitical and economic interests. One cannot disregard the US support for repressive reactionary regimes, either.

In this connection, Gullet touches upon the question of finding ways to "minimize the dangers of cynicism and moral implausibility". In his opinion, this can best be done by working through international agencies, among which he mentions the UN Commission on Human Rights and Amnesty International.

Gullet suggests that the US Administration should encourage Amnesty International's activity. Elaborating on this idea he indicates that "encouragement ... might include the provision of significant funds to such private groups as Amnesty International". Funds should also be provided to the Geneva-based International Commission of Jurists.

We should like to draw the reader's attention to Gullet's enlightening comment: "Such aid would have to be given without strings, so that

it would not make these organizations appear to be instruments of US influence...". Further comment is obviously needless.

Thus, Fascell and Gullet helped us to unveil the mystery of the pieces of silver transferred to Amnesty International's treasury.

Are there no strings attached to the funds allotted to Amnesty International? Are the terms of "aid" not specified? That is what I wondered about recalling the talk I had in the summer of 1975, during the preparations for the Helsinki Conference, with a competent public figure from the West who was familiar with the inner workings of Amnesty International. We touched upon the publications which were being prepared by the organisation. The man I talked with said that the publication of the advertised brochures would undoubtedly hamper the elaboration and implementation of the principles of co-operation and security in Europe. For this reason AI International Secretariat would hasten to publish the brochures. "They will not give up their intentions," my interlocutor said. "The funds have been appropriated. They must be utilized," he added thoughtfully.

However, it is not only its London-based International Secretariat's budget that Amnesty International depends on. There are also ample means channelled directly into its national branches.

Amnesty's activists will glibly explain to you that funds roll in from various sources. And it is only natural that the donors share the ideological and political stand of the recipients. No wonder that in the Federal Republic of Germany, Amnesty International is supported by the ultra-conservative advocates of anti-detente and irresponsible confrontation, i.e. those who follow in the wake of Franz Josef Strauss. In the Uni-

ted States it is backed by the AFL-CIO trade union bureaucracy known for their hostile attitude to the socialist countries.

What is the rationale behind the generosity of Amnesty International's backers? What prompted the plans to give indirect financial support to Amnesty International's activity from special appropriations by US Congress? It has long been known that pieces of silver are not paid for nothing.

What are the funds that have swollen to hundreds upon hundreds of thousands of pounds spent on?

The lion's share of the expenditure side of Amnesty International's budget is taken up by the following three items.

First come the expenses involved in trumping up materials intended to bolster subversive ideological campaigns against the USSR and other socialist countries.

Then come the funds from which pittance is doled out to the criminals whom Amnesty International portrays as "prisoners of conscience", i.e. people subjected to repression for their political and religious beliefs. In rendering selective financial assistance Amnesty International gives priority to "the most promising ones", i.e. those prepared to supply frauds fit for use in the actions aimed at disseminating misinformation.

Lastly, there are funds used to support the renegades and defectors from the socialist countries, who are employed as Amnesty International's "consultants", "experts" and "informers". These funds are also spent on covering travel expenses of the above-mentioned propagators of lies and hatred, who are ready, for a small tip, to make any kind of statement, before any audience, at any time and place.

Amnesty International's leaders do not take trouble to conceal that while enacting their financial projects they consciously and purposefully break the legal norms and the customs regulations of various countries, including the USSR. In one of its annual reports Amnesty International confesses that although travel and currency rules impose limitations on its programme of aid to prisoners in the Soviet Union and East European countries, it still manages to render material assistance to prisoners and their families in these countries through the AI International Secretariat and adoption groups.

Illegal currency operations, the smuggling of money and valuables, as well as liaison functions, are entrusted primarily to the members of Amnesty International branches, or "adoption groups" as they are referred to in Amnesty International's report.

Curiously enough, these undercover operations were for a long time co-ordinated by Alexander Paul Scheffler, a once condemned Nazi war criminal, who is currently an activist of the Amnesty International Hamburg branch.

According to the documents found in the archives, Scheffler was born in 1913 in the Novgorod province of Russia. He and his parents had lived in Leningrad until 1928, when the family moved to Germany. During the war, Scheffler, who had a good command of Russian, interrogated and tortured Soviet people. As was established by the military court, he participated in the Nazi interrogations in Gomel, Orsha, Bobruisk and in POW camp No.203. As a result of the investigation and the trial Scheffler was found guilty, either directly or indirectly, of the death of many Soviet citizens.

In our days, no longer able to vent his ha-

tred for the Soviet Union in the manner he did when he wore a Nazi uniform, Scheffler decided to offer his services to Amnesty International. He was put in charge of smuggling the money earmarked by Amnesty International for pecuniary aid to the "helpful" subjects abroad. Scheffler's ways and duties were adopted by a certain Angela Pliske (b.1937), a resident of Waldorf. On his way back from the USSR, where he had been on an errand for Amnesty International, Scheffler tried to avoid the customs and smuggle various antiques, the export of which is prohibited owing to their historical value. Pliske followed suit, smuggling into the USSR large sums of Soviet money. She carried the banknotes in face cream tins, under a layer of cream.

The list of agents engaged in smuggling enumerates, among others, Amnesty International's emissaries Valtraud and Roland Dumonts and Gunter Lott.

The Samizdat Operation

The campaign intended to picture the USSR as a seat of regular human rights violations is mapped out in keeping with the strategy of stirring up tensions in international relations. It involves the use of specific devices designed to lend plausibility to the propaganda items supplied to the market.

One can hardly expect the fiction about the violation of human rights, unwarranted prosecution and imprisonment in the USSR to draw public attention unless names and materials (that can figure as at least outward evidence) are adduced.

Hence the need for "proofs" and "materials" that can be marked "made in the USSR".

The fabrication and dissemination of such materials constitute what the falsifiers themselves refer to, at the prompting from the West, as the "Samizdat operation".

The initial stage consists in concocting a story. Then, several hand- or type-written copies of the "original" are made.

Does the story go to the Soviet press? No. Primarily because it lacks the principal and indispensable property of the information intended for publication—authenticity. The Soviet press rejects all sorts of conjecture and fabrication. The point is, however, that the fictitious materials in question are not at all intended for the press. They are meant to retain the flavour of originality characteristic of self-published (albeit in an edition of two or three copies) materials. Because in this case they can be described as "underground" and "uniquely authentic".

Then the materials are handed on to be reproduced and disseminated all over the world.

Planning and co-ordinating the Samizdat operation are the responsibility of various special services. The role of a producer and organiser has been assigned to Amnesty International. The latter has actively participated in creating the myth about the existence of illegal "rights-protection" literature in the USSR. For instance, it inculcated into the Western propaganda the myth about a periodical entitled *A Chronicle of Current Events*.

As a participant in the above-mentioned operation, Amnesty International is primarily concerned with publishing and disseminating the English version of the *Chronicle*. In so doing, it makes every effort to lend outward respectability to the anonymous leaflets it collects, pieces together and publishes. The

publication has been given a periodical's index, ISBN No.0900058. Amnesty International advertises the *Chronicle* as "a journal of the human rights movement in the USSR".

Initially, the "journal" was distributed by Amnesty International's London publication department, with the subscription fees transferred to the current joint account No.537304002 and marked "Subscription Chronicle". Later, the distribution was intrusted to the Routledge Journals.

Amnesty International also acts as a promoter and communicator in cases when investigation of complaints by an international organisation is instigated.

Thus, Amnesty International regulates the dissemination of false information in the West.

Creating the impression that there exists a reliable source of information about the alleged human rights violations in the USSR constitutes the first stage, as it were, of the operation. Great pains are taken to make believe that this source disposes of materials coming directly from the USSR.

At the second stage of the operation, the documents obtained from this "source" are used to prepare surveys, studies and the like. As Amnesty International and other similar subversive centres see it, this is a sure way to impart credibility to their publications.

Amnesty International's leaders have repeatedly acknowledged that their reports about so-called "prisoners of conscience" and political persecution in the USSR are grounded on and contain numerous references to illegal productions.

Amnesty International's publishers recognise that the main source of Amnesty International's knowledge about political imprisonment in the USSR is Samizdat, i.e. writings published and

distributed without an official permission. The most important of them is *A Chronicle of Current Events*, a bimonthly devoted to the human rights issue.

Thus, the materials resulting from Amnesty International's machinations are, in their turn, used to lend a plausible appearance to the wholesale distortion and slanderous representation of the exercise of political and civil rights in the USSR.

In the introduction to the second edition of Amnesty International's big hit, a major libel entitled "Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR", its authors indicate that the sources they have relied on are illegal materials, i.e. "writings published privately without official sanction or censorship".

Cognizant of the origin of these materials and of the motive inspiring those who supply them, Amnesty International goes out of its way to convince the reader of the absolute trustworthiness of its sources. The statement Amnesty's leaders make to this effect is amazing: "The authenticity of these materials has never been questioned by the Soviet authorities.... Amnesty proceeds from their authenticity."

What do they mean by saying that the Soviet authorities have never questioned the materials trumped up by Amnesty International itself or concocted at its instigation? What does Amnesty International expect? An official refutation?

The thing is that the manufacturers and distributors of such materials are fully aware of their slanderous nature. These materials are fabricated with the object of discrediting Soviet power. They are intended exclusively for duplication, distribution and consumption in the West. They are multiplied and used by those who commission them. They do not and cannot excite

any interest in the Soviet Union. For the Soviet reader the very idea of libel is repulsive.

Amnesty International's bosses know very well that these materials are not authentic. There is actually no need for explanations, clarifications or refutations. Nonetheless, the Soviet attitude to the operation launched by Amnesty International has been repeatedly made known to its leaders.

Mr. Ennals must remember the talk we had in April 1975. The International Association of Democratic Lawyers was holding its congress at the resort town of Sidi Fredj in Algeria. By tradition, the congresses of the Association, which unites democratic lawyers from many countries, are open. On coming to Sidi Fredj, Mr. Ennals made persistent efforts to meet the leaders of the Association of Soviet Lawyers. On his repeated requests, the meeting took place late one evening in the lobby of L'Hotel du Port. I remember it very well. It turned out that Mr. Ennals wanted to hand us the manuscript of a "report on the prisoners of conscience in the USSR" which was then ready to go to press. We went over "the report". The grossly tendentious selection of materials, groundless conclusions, the distortion of facts and unsupported generalisations leapt to the eye. We pointed to the lack of proofs and commented on the true nature of the lampoons that figured in the report as "initial materials".

The following example will help to see such "authentic" materials in perspective.

The materials on human rights violations in the USSR forwarded to the West by Yuri Orlov contained "information" (Supplement to Document No. 7) on the "prosecution of the organisers of a dockers' strike" in Riga charged with a partic-

ularly grave offence against the state. The verification showed that none of the people mentioned by Orlov had ever been made answerable for wrongdoing or put on trial in the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic. Moreover, people going by the names mentioned in Orlov's communication have never lived at the addresses indicated therein. Neither have they worked in the Riga port. Nor is a strike known to have ever taken place there.

Orlov and his accomplices made up and sent abroad a whole series of similar materials intended for dissemination and use by the Western mass media. I was once shown a set of twenty such "documents" at Faculta di Magistero in Bologna. This particular set had been duplicated in Rome (at Studio Ega Congressi, 19, Viale Tiziano) and forwarded to the organs of the press, public organisations, universities and politicians.

Materials of this kind were widely disseminated and used, on Orlov's initiative, by the anti-Soviet centres and the more aggressive information media in the West for the purposes of ideological subversion. They were reprinted by the Posev publishing house of the PLU, a reactionary emigre organisation, and made use of by *Continente*, a journal known for its hostility towards the Soviet Union. Radio Liberty, for instance, has often "relied" in its malicious broadcasts on the materials cooked up by Orlov.

Orlov's pasquils were reproduced as "an authentic source" by the so-called US Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. They were used to bolster the notorious human rights campaign aimed at interfering in the Soviet domestic affairs. In November 1980, during the general discussion at the first stage of the Madrid Meeting of the participants in the Con-

ference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the head of the US delegation, in a bid to prove that the Soviet Union did not implement the Helsinki accords, cited the information provided by Orlov.

Orlov's activity was deliberately directed at inflicting political damage to the Soviet Union. The materials with which he equipped those who strove to impair the Soviet Union's international prestige served precisely this purpose.

In employing Orlov's inventions, Amnesty International would emphasise that it relied on "an authentic document" or "a competent report". Later in this book we shall have a closer look at the mixture of downright garbling and artful, jesuitical cunning that went into concocting the chapter devoted to the conditions in the Soviet corrective labour institutions in Amnesty International's notorious Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR. For the present, we shall confine ourselves to noting that Amnesty's highly-skilled editors go out of their way to impart an air of evidentiality to what is in fact gross adulteration. Their "factual" materials include, for instance, so-called Document No.3 on the conditions and treatment of the prisoners of conscience fabricated by Yuri Orlov and his accomplice Anatoly Shcharansky.

There is one curious circumstance that should be noted: the first edition of Amnesty International's Report, published in 1975, did not contain any references to Document No.3. The point is that Orlov and Shcharansky made up their "document", or "authoritative testimony" much later. They borrowed the details about the treatment of prisoners from Amnesty International's 1975 Report, condensed them into a "document", assigned it, for greater show, a number, and sent it to Amnesty International. The latter included it,

as a documentary source, into the 1980 edition of the Report.

This illustrates the true value and the true purpose of the Samizdat materials.

Amnesty International and the 1980 Olympics

Four days had passed since the peaceful Olympic fire was lit at Moscow's Central Stadium in Luzhniki. Athletes went on competing under the Olympic flag raised in Moscow. Even the sceptics were compelled to recognise that the will of nations to maintain contacts and co-operate was unconquerable.

Honesty presided over the 1980 Olympic Games, directing the competition and naming the victors. Honesty goes hand in hand with truthfulness and sincerity. Unfortunately, they were not always found in what Western commentators reported to their listeners and readers. The discordant note struck by their reports echoed the ill will of those who sought to hamper the furtherance of the noble ideals of the Olympic movement. The plans for a boycott thwarted, it remained only to resort to slander.

On the evening of July 22, the Voice of America announced that Amnesty International had made public the precise number of "dissenters" imprisoned or confined to psychiatric hospitals during the preparations for the Olympic Games. According to Amnesty International, their number ran to 114.

The Voice of America and Amnesty International, expecting the myth about 114 dissenters to shock the public, had waited for a suitable time to contribute their mite to the concerted efforts to poison the atmosphere of the Moscow Olym-

pics. (As for the way Amnesty International juggles with figures to calculate the numbers of supposed "victims of political repression" in the USSR, we shall come to it later.)

Typically, Amnesty International mapped out the course of action to shatter the atmosphere of the international festival of sport and friendship in good time.

In July 1979, its International Secretariat designed a programme of subversive actions to be timed to coincide with the Moscow Olympics. The programme, approved in August by the International Executive Committee, provided for the co-ordination of activities connected with the 1980 Olympics by a special group and emphasised the importance of participating in the "Olympic campaign" or, to be more exact, in the anti-Olympic racket raised, by the national sections of Amnesty International, in particular by those in the neutral countries.

Amnesty International's document EUR 46/42/79 was released in London at 1000 hrs GMT on October 10, 1979. In a way, it was Amnesty's first volley fired at the Moscow Olympics. Amnesty's leaders disclosed their intention to launch an international campaign to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet government. They spoke about the extensive actions their organisation planned to initiate, in particular, with a view to influencing the International Olympics Committee and various national Olympics Committees.

It is in document EUR 46/42/79 that Amnesty International first propounded a mendacious, unsubstantiated, totally unsupported allegation about a campaign of mass repressions to be launched in the USSR on the eve of the Olympic Games.

The document reads as follows: "Amnesty International believes that, in anticipation of the large number of foreign visitors in Moscow dur-

ing the Olympic Games, /the Soviet/ Government has ordered the transfer of prisoners of conscience out of prisons and psychiatric hospitals in or near the Moscow area and into distant areas. One potential effect of these transfers is to conceal political imprisonment and to prevent any potential contact, however indirect, between these prisoners and the thousands of foreign visitors to Moscow during the Olympic Games."

This was the way the sensational fiction about the repressions launched before and at the time of the Olympics started to unwind.

The tale was immediately caught up by a concordant chorus of radio voices: the Voice of America, the BBC, Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe, Deutsche Welle, Radio Rome, Radio Canada.

Curiously enough, the BBC reported about Amnesty International's new campaign at 11 p.m. on October 9, while Amnesty's own announcement came at 10 a.m. on October 10. However, this is a matter of the BBC's and Amnesty International's relations.

With every passing broadcast the story trumped up by Amnesty International sounded increasingly affirmative and categorical.

As early as 5.30 p.m. on October 10, Radio Canada, referring to Amnesty International, declared in no uncertain terms that "the Soviet Union transferred political prisoners out of prisons and psychiatric hospitals in Moscow and into distant areas". The words "Amnesty International *believes*", contained in the original text, were omitted.

The BBC kept on broadcasting Amnesty's myth for several days running. On the 14th of October it announced that Amnesty International "*reported* that Baptists in the Moscow area have been threatened with mass expulsion and forced resettlement at the time of the Olympic games".

The publication by Amnesty International of a revised version of the Report *Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions* in April 1980 was another peculiar contribution to the anti-Olympics campaign.

While the first edition of Amnesty International's major anti-Soviet report was timed to coincide with the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the second came out on the eve of the Olympic Games in Moscow.

However, when during the second week of the Olympic Games the Voice of America was compelled, for want of a better red herring, to incorporate in its evening programmes excerpts from Amnesty International's Report, it became obvious that the ideological and political campaign against the Moscow Olympics had failed.

Amnesty International's efforts to torpedo the Olympic Games proved equally pathetic.

The Unholy Trinity: Amnesty International, Radio Liberty and Co.

From Amnesty International's publicity materials we learn that this organisation claims complete independence. Each of them is bound to begin with a standard allegation: "Amnesty International is a movement independent of any government, political association, ideology, economic interest or religious denomination."

Is this much-vaunted independence that perfect?

Indeed, Amnesty International is not formally incorporated in the system of government offices of any one state.

At the same time, there exists a network of informal ties in which it is involved. This network is based primarily on personal contacts between Amnesty International's functionaries

and government institutions and various organisations occupying key positions in the ideological subversion system and financed from the state budget.

Personal contacts provide for secret co-ordination of strategies.

To substantiate the foregoing we shall acquaint the reader with a typical document. On August 21, 1980 the "research group" of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty issued a confidential document RL 297/80 marked: "prepared for the use of the staff Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty".

In as many as 22 pages the author makes recommendations as to the ways of exploiting the theme of "dissent" in the Soviet Union.

It is noteworthy that the author of the document is none other than Peter Reddaway, one of the leaders of the British national section of Amnesty International, located at the same address as Amnesty's International headquarters (10, Southampton Str., London).

Peter Reddaway has quite an impressive record of professional propaganda work aimed at weakening the ideas of detente and peaceful coexistence of states with different socio-political systems. As early as 1965, as an exchange student at Moscow State University, he was engaged in activities incompatible with the aims and principles of international scientific exchanges and with the norms of behaviour of foreign citizens. By order of the Soviet authorities Reddaway had to leave the USSR.

Since then, Peter Reddaway, who now occupies a leading post in Amnesty International and is on the staff of the London School of Economics and Political Science, has been interested in studying the efficacy of anti-Soviet provocations. In October 1980 he was among the speakers at

the World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies at Garmisch-Partenkirchen (FRG). "The Case Study in the Efficacy of Dissent", a report he presented at this international assemblage of sovietologists, abounded in slanderous allegations about the abuse of psychiatry for political purposes in the USSR. (We shall comment on this in more detail later.) Reddaway maintains stable contacts with the Paris office of Radio Liberty, the Bureau for Radio Audience and Efficacy Studies, founded by US special services and headed by M. Rallis, a member of the CIA's permanent staff.

As we see, one of Amnesty International's leaders is actively involved in co-ordinating ideological subversion and officiates as an expert of the Munich-based Radio Liberty/Radio Free Europe.

The manufacture of falsified materials intended to "substantiate" the fiction on human rights violations in the USSR, i.e. an important part of subversive activity, is also concentrated in Munich. Here again we deal with invisible threads leading from one instigator of ideological sabotage to another and uniting their efforts into a single undertaking.

The so-called informational materials are prepared by the Radio Liberty research department (headed, by the way, by Keith Bush of the CIA). A special role here is assigned to one Kronid Lyubarsky, a renegade who, on settling in Munich, has been taken to Radio Liberty's care. He figures as the "publisher" of the biweekly *U.S.S.R. News Brief*. The procedure of fabricating the latter is as follows. The materials are prepared by the research department of the subversive broadcasting stations and then sent to the publishing house Les Cahiers du Samizdat in Brussels to be printed in Russian and English.

To give Lyubarsky a reputation of a person having access to the first-hand sources of information obtained from the USSR, he is billed as a member of Amnesty International's Moscow group.

Amnesty International has permanent contacts with many organisations having a special role to play in straining international tensions and undermining mutual confidence, an indispensable element of detente and mutual understanding between nations.

Among such organisations is, for instance, Glaube in der 2. Welt (Belief in the Second World), an "institute" located in Zollikon at Züricher See. Founded in 1972, this "institute" specialises in handling tendentious apocryphal information on the persecution of churches and religious believers in the East European socialist countries (i.e. the countries of the "second world"). We have in many instances dealt with the materials "processed" by the "institute". In them, ignorance and the lack of information about the true status of the church in the socialist countries are mixed with the fervour and desire to stigmatise, accuse and condemn, which contradicts the spirit of the Testaments.

According to what Eugen Voss, the head of the "institute", says in the booklet *Reden, wo andere Schweigen müssen* ("To Speak Where Others Are Forced to Keep Silence"), his organisation supplies reference materials to Amnesty International's groups all over Western Europe.

Amnesty International's Guest Tour Agency

Amnesty International's headquarters have an appearance of a place where things are done in a big way.

The AI International Secretariat is fitted up, for instance, with a programmes department and a research department. It has a legal adviser on its staff. It formulates long-term programmes and "special projects", publishes monthly bulletins, conducts briefings, circulates press releases and news-letters, distributes materials for general use and those intended for the staff only.

Special emphasis is made on co-ordinating actions vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The promotion of concerted and efficient anti-Soviet campaigns is the responsibility of special "co-ordination groups" or "co-ordinators" appointed by each national section and reporting directly to the International Secretariat. The regular conferences convened by the International Secretariat are attended by such experienced co-ordinators as E.Fisher (the Netherlands), M.Ackerlundch (Sweden), R.Pio Serre (Italy), I. Zeltman (USA), I.Postema (Denmark). The business of the conferences includes the exchange of experience in the employment of rights-violation issues.

One cannot fail to notice that Amnesty International's actions vis-a-vis the Soviet Union are planned in such a way as to coincide with "strategically favourable" occasions and dates. They are co-ordinated and carried out on the basis of centralised instruction of the co-ordinators and regular exchange of information among them.

The way actions are co-ordinated and mapped out, the sufficiently close contacts between the headquarters and the national sections, the patronage and stage direction provided by the International Secretariat show that the responsibility for the actions taken against the Soviet Union is shared by Amnesty International's central office and its national branches.

On November 12, 1980 various sections of

Amnesty International simultaneously issued an international news release entitled "Amnesty International's Answer to *Izvestiya*."

In this news release, Thomas Hammarberg, a Swedish journalist and Amnesty International's new Secretary General, tries to vindicate his organisation in connection with the exposure of its activities in the articles by V.Barsov and M.Mikhailov published in *Izvestiya* (on August 25 and 26, 1980) under the headlines "Whom Are You Defending, Gentlemen? (on a branch of imperialist secret services)" and "Masks Are Removed". In these articles their authors, Soviet journalists, speak about concrete facts and concrete people, mention real names and bring to life concrete connections and interrelationships. As for the AI news release of November 12, 1980, its author confines himself to inconcrete and highly general declarations.

It is not our intention to analyse them at this moment. We shall dwell only upon Thomas Hammarberg's attempt to convince the reader of the independence and impartiality of Amnesty International by claiming that it neither supports nor opposes any one government or political system.

There is no point in plunging into an abstract discussion with Thomas Hammarberg. There are quite a few facts that can easily disprove his allegation. Note, for instance, that among Amnesty International's functions is arranging public appearance of such enemies of Soviet power as Victor Bukovsky and Leonid Plyushch, who have availed themselves of hospitality in Western Europe.

On their settling in the West, these people were offered abundant opportunity to vent their hatred for the Soviet Union as far as possible. In their case we are confronted with something

more than ephemeral non-conformity or dissent, the seeds of dissidence, so to speak. It is an open, direct, and venomous attack against the Soviet Union's social, political and economic systems.

Indeed, why should Amnesty International's Secretary General Thomas Hammarberg make public his enmity towards the Soviet Union political system? Why should Amnesty International urge an overthrow of the Soviet Government? Let this be done by the Bukovskys, the Plyushches and their likes. As for Amnesty International, it prefers to act as their impresario, financing and making a fuss of their guest tours, gathering their audience, trying to profit by this activity.

The entire situation is tragicomic: Amnesty International's artistes on tour, half-learned, uninformed dilettantes, ignorant of political theory and practice, equipped with neither empirical data nor analytical knowledge, come out with forecasts and global assessments.

What do Amnesty International's guest artistes and travelling men, the promoters of hatred and malice, prophesy on their tours?

According to *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, Leonid Plyushch, while "on a visit to the FRG as a guest of Amnesty International", spoke at the Haus der Kirche in Dusseldorf, describing the horrors that would result from "capitulating to the Soviet Union's policy". He tried to intimidate the audience by forecasting a catastrophe that would ensue from "a new Munich deal". Plyushch, as we see, distorts the meaning of the realistic policy aimed at developing normal, mutually beneficial relations between the FRG and the USSR.

In an interview published by Munich's *Sddeutsche Zeitung* Plyushch said that it was not enough to support the dissenters in the USSR

morally. What was also needed, he stressed, was "practical assistance"(sic!) on the part, in particular, of such organisations as Amnesty International, because the regime obtaining in the USSR could be changed "only as a result of pressure from the West". Isn't it interesting to note that Plyushch makes the point of "changing the regime" in the context of an appeal for "practical assistance" from Amnesty International? And that it is Amnesty International's people who organised Plyushch's tour of the FRG?

We shall speak more about who exactly Plyushch is later. Details are not relevant at this stage. The point is that when Plyushch was treated by Soviet doctors for mental illness, Amnesty International tried to gamble on the fact that Plyushch was "an example of forcible confinement of human rights champions to psychiatry hospitals".

When Plyushch's condition improved somewhat, Amnesty International began making use of him in its interests.

And what about a week's tour of Sweden by Bukovsky? Who invited him? Again it was Amnesty International or, rather, its Swedish national section, the one that had for a long time been headed by Thomas Hammarberg, Amnesty International's present Secretary General.

It is a well-known fact that Bukovsky has been employed for more than four years now to fan the anti-Soviet hysteria at every new round of enhancing the atmosphere of animosity and hatred for the Soviet Union. Materials signed by Bukovsky and constituting a mixture of furious hatred and drab misinformation are offered to the Western press and sometimes penetrate even such respectable newspapers as *Le Monde*.

We analysed one such writing. In it, an attempt

is made to fashion "legal" arguments against holding the Olympic Games in Moscow. This article made us question the authorship of the whole set of such writings: the legal materials used in the article, including the first decrees of Soviet power and the newspaper materials of the time, are of a highly specific nature. The authors have failed *Le Monde*'s editors: their conclusions and assertions revealed ignorance of the real facts, historical data and details of Soviet legislation. Obviously, such details are not taken into account in a drive to spread misinformation as wide as possible. What is important is raising a racket at a suitable moment.

The same principle is followed by those people from Amnesty International who co-ordinate the tours of guest artistes. Admittedly, Amnesty International's guest tour agency disposes of only a few actors. Various anti-Soviet gatherings in different parts of Europe and elsewhere are always attended by Plyushch, Bukovsky, Fainberg and Amalrik....

No, Amalrik no longer participates in the anti-Soviet assemblages. In early November 1980 he died in an accident on the way to Madrid where he was being taken to stage a hysterical performance in front of the building where the Madrid Meeting of the representatives of the countries which co-signed the Final Act on Security and Co-operation in Europe was held. Fainberg and Borisov, who were riding in the same car, got away with just a fright. So these two will be sent on more tours. This especially concerns Fainberg who is easy to transport: he lives in London, in close vicinity of Amnesty International which had picked him up on Peter Reddaway's recommendation. Fainberg has a part time job with Amnesty International, while

working full time for the London office of Radio Liberty.

Amnesty International's activists serve either as "eye-witnesses" or "human rights experts". They are employed for the performances organised or instigated by Amnesty International. Sometimes they figure as authors of various writings published "outside" Amnesty International. Whenever there is a need for a pasquil to be published in Frankfurt, Brussels, Paris or elsewhere, K.Lyubarsky or P.Reddaway are ready to offer their "evidence" or "competent expertise". Whoever the author, the worth of these materials is just the same since they are obtained from the same murky source.

MISINFORMATION: THE WAY IT IS PRODUCED

Little Lies and Big Lies

Which are more dangerous, appalling, and repulsive: big lies or little lies? They are all alike. Or, rather, they are all bad in their own way. The thing is that little lies, even fibs, repeated time and again, form the bulk of misinformation, that very misinformation which is professionally cultivated by Amnesty International.

It is with a feeling of disgust that one turns over the pages of Amnesty International's reports on "prisoners of conscience" and other similar materials which seem to be woven from a cobweb of little lies interspersed with big lies.

One of the Amnesty International's favourite lies is the allegation that those Soviet citizens of Jewish origin who want to emigrate to Israel are subjected to reprisals and that the more active among them, the so-called "Jewish activists", are sentenced to long terms of imprisonment. In this connection, a few facts should be stated.

The problem of emigration is not of any great concern either to the majority of Soviet Jews or to the representatives of any other nationalities. There are certainly no economic, social or political factors which would make people wish to leave the USSR in search of a job, higher income or refuge promising survival, freedom or dignity.

The majority of Jews in the Soviet Union cherish their status of a Soviet citizen. They enjoy the benefits this status guarantees and consciously perform their duty to the state and society. They participate in the magnificent process of creating a new type of society as true patriots, sincerely devoted to their Motherland.

And still, what about those Jews who, for one reason or another, but primarily for that of being reunited with their families, express their desire to emigrate from the Soviet Union?

As is known, 98.4 per cent of those wishing to emigrate have been granted and 1.6 per cent have been refused exit visas.

What kind of people make up the latter category? They are those who, by virtue of their job, have had access to information classified as a state secret. The refusal they are confronted with is a temporary one. In our age of rocketing scientific and technological development, confidential information may soon become outdated. If this is the case, i.e. if the circumstances that determined the refusal of an exit visa have changed, those who re-apply for a permission to leave are granted one.

However, the Zionist circles, seeking to multiply the influx of manpower to Israel, exaggerate the problem of refusals issued to an insignificant part of the would-be emigres to truly fantastic dimensions. An element in the campaign they wage is the allegation about reprisals against those who wish to emigrate. Amnesty International is an active participant in the campaign.

The authors of the Report on Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR refer to the "case of Joseph Begun" as an example of such reprisals. The opening paragraph of Begun's story expounded on page 59 of the second edition of the Report reads as follows: "Joseph Begun, born in 1932, is a

highly-qualified mathematician. Beginning in 1951 he was gainfully employed for 20 years without interruption and by 1971 he was employed as a senior scientific worker in the USSR State Planning Commission in Moscow. He was dismissed from his post in that year after applying to emigrate to Israel."

It is true that in 1971 Begun worked, for less than two months, at the Central Economics Scientific Research Institute of the USSR State Planning Commission. He started work on February 1, 1971. However, as early as March of that year he gave in a notice. On April 6, 1971 he gave in another notice specifying his reasons for wishing to be dismissed from his post. This notice is kept in the Institute's files. On April 10, Begun was dismissed from his post in keeping with the desire he had himself expressed, and not sacked for his intention to emigrate to Israel, as the authors of Amnesty International's Report wish us to believe. Thus, the exposition of Begun's case, "a typical", as Amnesty International puts it, example of "reprisals" against the would-be emigres, starts with a downright lie.

Between 1951 and 1971, Begun tried, of his own free will, fourteen jobs. As we see, he was not in the habit of keeping a job for a long time.

The thing is that while holding various jobs Begun accumulated information related to the security of the Soviet State. For this reason Begun, a specialist in radio electronics (and not mathematics, as Amnesty International wants us to believe), was refused an exit visa.

What happened after 1971? Let us have a look at what Amnesty International has to say about it. "After 1972 Begun earned income by giving private Hebrew lessons. In late 1976 and early 1977 he was particularly active in the Jewish emigra-

tion rights campaign and he was issued a warning for 'parasitism'. Twice Begun wrote to responsible local authorities, the first time to explain the reasons for which he did not have regular paid employment, the second time to ask for help in finding the job. However, he was arrested on 3 March 1977 and charged with 'parasitism'. He was tried in June that year and sentenced to two years exile." And what happened in reality?

The state authorities interfered in Joseph Begun's life and applied coercive measures to him only when it was established by a court of law (during the open proceedings held on June 28, 1977) that Begun had been conducting a parasitical way of life for a period of no less than 4 years, violating thereby the Constitutional provision on the duties of the Soviet citizen.

Begun did not want to take up jobs suited to his particular profession or to be otherwise engaged in socially useful labour. It is well known that unemployment is non-existent in the USSR and there is no redundant manpower. The only thing that is needed in order to get a job is a desire to work.

After Begun voluntarily gave up his work at the Central Economics Institute in 1971, repeated attempts were made to help him find employment. He was several times invited to the Employment Bureau of the Moscow City Labour Resources Board where he was offered a wide range of employment opportunities. In 1973, 1974, and 1975 Begun was repeatedly offered a choice of engineer's jobs, i.e. employment suited to his profession and qualification. Begun rejected all of them. The last time he was invited to the Employment Bureau (on February 20, 1975), he did not turn up there at all.

All this is attested by various documents.

Among the papers kept in the files there are Begun's own applications, notices and written refusals to accept the jobs offered to him.

At the same time, between 1973 and 1976 Begun lived quite comfortably, spending long periods at the Crimean resorts. How could he possibly afford to live in style without working? Of course, he could have been spending his savings, but his main means of subsistence was remittances from Canada, Denmark and other countries. The trial established that the remittances were paid out to him by the USSR Bank for Foreign Trade on 15 occasions. Still more profitable for him were the valuable parcels he received from abroad, the contents of which he sold at exorbitant prices. The receipt of such parcels has been confirmed by the Moscow Customs Office.

As for Begun's reference to the lessons of Hebrew he gave, the latter were used as a cover for his black-market operations.

The facts testify to the following.

Between 1971 and 1977, as the trial confirmed, Begun had only four Hebrew students, each of whom he taught for a short time. Therefore, Begun's income could not have come solely from giving Hebrew lessons.

We spoke about Joseph Begun in great detail not because his life merits special interest or has been marked by any outstanding achievements. We did so because a detailed analysis is always instrumental in exposing Amnesty International's distortion of facts, especially in those cases when its leaders suppose that what they say cannot be verified.

It is not for the first time that we had to deal with Begun's case. Certain Zionist organisations in the United States, which claim the role of the defenders of the Soviet Jews, tried

to give quite a different interpretation to Begun's story.

The American Jewish Committee, together with the self-styled National Conference on Soviet Jewry, sought to employ the Begun case to stir a noisy campaign on the alleged discrimination against Jews by the Soviet authorities.

A detailed analysis of the methods used by Amnesty International to distort facts and produce misinformation will help us to get an insight into "the anatomy of lies". We shall scrutinise Amnesty International's techniques by examining Begun's case. Amnesty International's experts begin with the following premise: as soon as a Soviet Jew applies to emigrate to Israel, the punitive mechanism is set in motion. This is lie No. 1. Then, Amnesty International's people look for a case of an actual conviction of a person of Jewish origin. Despite the obvious absence of any link between the premise (lie No. 1) and the concrete case of conviction, the latter is employed to substantiate the false basic allegation. Thus, lie No. 2 is produced.

Let us demonstrate this in a more concrete way. In the second edition of the Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR we read: "Among Soviet Jews who during the four years preceding the writing of this report have been sentenced to imprisonment or exile for trying to emigrate through legal means are...". A long list of names follows. It begins with Joseph Begun and enumerates, among others, Anatoly Shcharansky.

Who is Anatoly Shcharansky and what he was tried for?

Anatoly Shcharansky, born in 1948, upon graduating from the Physical-Technical Institute worked as an engineer and later as a senior engineer at a defence industry research organi-

sation. Upon applying for an exit visa to Israel, Shcharansky gave up his job so as to devote all his efforts to "social activity". From March 1975 to February 1977 he did not have any definite employment; he only worked for less than a month as a secretary of a retired professor.

Shcharansky was refused an exit visa since he had had access to classified information on defence matters. He was a young professional, therefore the information he had access to was of no particular importance. But a defence secret always remains a secret. A certain period would have elapsed and the term of the moratorium would have expired. But Shcharansky did not wish to wait. He took to crime instead.

In March 1977 Shcharansky was arrested. From July 10 to 14, 1978 the Collegium of the RSFSR Supreme Court examined the charges brought against Anatoly Shcharansky under Paragraph "a", Article 64 and Section 1, Article 70 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.

The Collegium found Shcharansky guilty of assisting foreign states in carrying on subversive activity against the USSR, collecting and handing over information constituting the state secret of the USSR to foreign states, as well as of anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda expressed in fabricating and disseminating materials slandering the Soviet Union.

Shcharansky committed high treason, namely espionage, on the orders received from the US secret agent V.R. via a Moscow correspondent of an American newspaper. In order to execute his errand, Shcharansky gathered and handed over to various foreign states information classified as the state secret of the USSR. For instance, in 1976 and 1977 he regularly questioned (either personally or with the help of his accomplices) those who had been refused exit visas owing to

their knowledge of state secrets. He collected data on the nature of the enterprises and offices in which the several hundred people he questioned had been employed. Shcharansky analysed, grouped, classified and made several lists of the data he collected. In expert opinion, the lists contained information on "a number of classified enterprises of the defence industry and some undertakings related to them, on what industries they come under, their location and classification, which information is secret and, cumulatively, constitutes a state secret of the USSR".

Until he was arrested in March 1977, Shcharansky had used various channels to forward the information he collected to the West.

In November 1976, he acquainted the Moscow correspondent of *The Los Angeles Times* R. Toth with some of the data which constitute a state secret. This inspired Toth to write an article on "the ways Russia indirectly disclosed information on its secret research centres". He published Shcharansky's list of enterprises compiled in accordance with the list of persons refused exit visas for security reasons, and called for banning, to the detriment of the development of international economic ties, the supply of advanced technology to the USSR. According to the Deutsche Welle's programme of November 24, 1976, the information revealed in R. Toth's article "facilitates intelligence agencies' work against the USSR".

Shcharansky's activity aimed to assist reactionary politicians and organisations in their subversive efforts directed against the USSR was diverse in form.

Shcharansky participated in fabricating and disseminating materials which contained, together with slanderous inventions on the political and

social realities in the Soviet Union, calls to interfere in the country's domestic affairs. As these materials were accumulated, they were regularly forwarded to the West through the diplomats and correspondents accredited in Moscow or through the politicians coming to Moscow on official visits. They were intended to be made use of in the efforts to impair Soviet political and economic interests.

The materials Shcharansky supplied to various circles known for their hostility towards the Soviet Union abounded in calls to pressurise the Soviet Government, on a plea of "defending the rights of Soviet citizens", into changing its domestic and foreign policies.

The materials trumped up by Shcharansky and his partners, such as their "Message to the American People and US Congress", or the "Survey" they handed to the US Embassy in Moscow, or their "Appeal" compiled on the occasion of passing the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the law on trade, urged to support the course aimed at undermining international trade. Note that the Jackson-Vanik amendment tied up the granting of credits and of the most-favoured-nation status to the socialist countries with the possibility for the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of these countries.

In September 1975, as was established by the court, during his talk with M.Lerman, one of the leaders of the Sohnut, an international Zionist organisation, Shcharansky called upon the Zionist circles to seize upon every opportunity to urge Western governments to bring greater pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. In particular, Shcharansky called for an embargo on the US supply of grain to the Soviet Union. In fabricating and disseminating numerous forged documents Shcharansky and his accomplices pursued the

goal of provoking hostility towards and undermining confidence in the Soviet Union, and disrupting international detente.

The set of seventeen "documents" fabricated by Shcharansky and Co. incorporated the whole range of slanderous allegations constantly employed by the anti-Soviet propaganda centres, the Munich-based subversive broadcasting stations Radio Liberty/Radio Free Europe and, naturally, Amnesty International. These documents include the so-called Document No.3 on conditions of prisoners of conscience, abounding in allegations about "physical and moral sufferings and torture by hunger" to which the prisoners are subjected. In June and July 1976 Shcharansky and his partners forwarded their "surveys", describing alleged persecution "for political, ethical and religious beliefs", to a number of governments.

Typically, some of the "documents" were made up in the form of petitions and collective appeals. Among them is the appeal dated December 1974 and entitled "Dear Brothers", and the appeal to US Congress dated February 12, 1976. During the trial, the expert examination established that all the signatures affixed to these "collective appeals" were forged by Shcharansky. To one of the documents Shcharansky put thirty of them.

In July 1975, during his confidential meeting in Moscow with the well-known kremlinologist and US Administration's adviser R. Pipes, Shcharansky discussed questions relating to the "efficacy" of subversive actions aimed at fomenting national strife in the USSR. According to Pipes, these actions are viewed by the US influential circles as a "powerful catalyst promoting the erosion of Soviet society". Shcharansky contributed his mite to enhancing the efficacy of these actions.

When his case was tried, Shcharansky pleaded guilty. In a bid to vindicate himself, he declared that he had not pursued any criminal goals in what he had done, his sole intention being to attract the attention of the world public to the problems facing the would-be emigres in the USSR.

However, Shcharansky's explanation of the motives behind his criminal actions was disproved by the evidence testifying to the hostile nature of his activity against the Soviet state and society. The evidence examined by the court brought to light the malicious intent behind Shcharansky's actions aimed at impairing the state sovereignty and the military power of the USSR. Shcharansky's actions were deliberately spearheaded at undermining the prestige of Soviet power.

While perpetrating his crimes Shcharansky was fully aware of the fact that the materials he fabricated or helped to fabricate were meant for use by the ideological warfare centres. Cognizant of the exploitation of his materials in subversive actions against the Soviet Union, Shcharansky supplemented them with "recommendations" on their repeated and more extensive use.

Shcharansky supplied foreign cameramen with "materials" distorting the position of national minorities in the USSR and participated in their unauthorised shooting of a film which was to be smuggled out of the country and entitled *Calculated Risk*. Shcharansky knew that the film was being shot with the object of slandering the Soviet Union.

As he followed the instructions on the kind of information to be collected, forwarded to him illegally (sometimes through diplomatic channels) by foreign intelligence services, Shcharansky

was by no means ignorant of the traitorous nature of his actions. Neither was he in the dark about the attitude to the Soviet Union of those foreign citizens, among them diplomats, journalists and subversion centres emissaries, who guided his activities and to whom he handed the information obtained on their request. The type of information they took interest in was indicative of their work for or links to intelligence agencies.

The court examined, in an objective and comprehensive manner, a wide range of evidence. Witnesses were questioned; experts' opinions were heard; papers, films, photographs, video and tape-recordings were scrutinised. During the proceedings Shcharansky was given abundant opportunity to bear testimony to and participate in the examination of every evidence in the case.

Among the proofs exposing the criminal nature of Shcharansky's actions and the ways they were planned and directed there is an original letter specifying the tasks to collect intelligence data, a questionnaire designed to elicit such data (with a hand-written note addressed to Shcharansky on its back), and copies of lists of enterprises and other materials containing classified information which were compiled by Shcharansky.

As was corroborated by testimony, Shcharansky was well paid—be it an advance payment or a final remuneration—and materially supported by his employers. He was told that the patronage on the part of overseas senators and various international organisations would guarantee his impunity. The idea of his "noble" mission was instilled in his mind. This could not but inspire and encourage Shcharansky, instigating him to ever new crimes against the Soviet Union.

No wonder those who had provoked Shcharansky to take up crime now accepted the mission of defending him.

In a bid to portray Shcharansky as a "prisoner of conscience", Amnesty International and his other well-wishers pass over in silence his having perpetrated concrete crimes, such as the collection and communication of confidential information. They persist in alleging that Shcharansky was convicted as a "Jewish activist" and an "organizer of Jewish emigration from the USSR". A close scrutiny of Shcharansky's criminal case exposes the falsity of these allegations. The perusal of the circumstances of Shcharansky's criminal activity destroys the groundwork of the misinformation produced by Amnesty International and challenges the image of a selfless "human rights champion" and a "dissenting Jewish activist" conjured up by Amnesty International.

Figure-Juggling

Figures are always impressive. Mostly, they strike one as something accurate and well-founded. However, a lie, even if supported by figures, remains a lie, no matter what efforts are made to beautify and ennoble it.

The psychological war strategists from Amnesty International are versed in figure-juggling as a method to produce misinformation. They have a particular penchant for round figures. When turning over the pages of Amnesty International's publications concerned with the Soviet Union, figure-juggling strikes the eye:

100 Protestants "are now prisoners of conscience";

300 persons "are imprisoned for political or religious reasons";

400 people "were tried and sentenced to imprisonment, internal exile or other punishment ...

or forcibly confined to psychiatric hospitals (1975 to 1979)";

1,000 Baptists "have been made prisoners";

10,000 is the total number of "prisoners of conscience in the USSR".

It is well-known that these figures are produced at Amnesty International's misinformation laboratories. The way they are fabricated is Amnesty International's secret. It is very rarely that part of it is unveiled.

On November 17, 1975 at a special press conference in London, Amnesty International's spokesman presented the journalists with a sensational mathematical puzzle. He announced that Amnesty International had calculated the exact number of those "imprisoned for their beliefs" in the Soviet Union. He said it was an exaggeration to claim that there were tens of millions(!) of prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union. Amnesty International had obtained another figure.... At this point we are faced with the amazing methods developed by Amnesty International.

Eighteen years before Amnesty International's notorious Report was published, Herald Berman, Professor of Law at Harvard, visited the USSR Deputy Procurator-General and asked him about the ratio of those convicted for crimes against the state (for all crimes in that category)¹

¹ For instance, the RSFSR Criminal Code in its 28 articles covering crimes against the state mentions the following: high treason, espionage, acts of terrorism, diversion and sabotage, war propaganda, non-observance of national and state equality, divulging of state secrets, brigandage, smuggling, evasion of conscription, illegal exit from and entry into the USSR, breach of international flight regulations, misuse of transport and disregard for transport safety rules, disruption of communications and means of transportation, forging of money and securities and the sale thereof, breach of finance regulations, etc.

to the total number of prisoners. The answer was: "Less than one per cent of the total number of prisoners." Professor Berman published his account of the talk.

Amnesty International experts decided to use the information in their own way. They reasoned that it would be too much trouble to deal with fractions and decided to take one per cent of one million. Why one million? Because when the CIA once studied satellite photographs of the Soviet Union, it decided to identify objects that look like penitentiaries. These were marked and their capacity was announced to be two or three million people. Amnesty International modestly said that two or three million was "in all probability" too many, one million would perhaps be closer to truth. One per cent of one million is 10,000. Hence the "absolutely reliable" figure: 10,000 people imprisoned for their beliefs in the Soviet Union. It does not take a criminologist or an expert in statistics to realise the absurdity of such calculations.

The figure stuck, just as Amnesty International expected: an impressive round figure looked reliable and the way it was calculated would soon be forgotten. Indeed, a short while later Peter Osnos of the *Washington Post* quoted the figure in his report from Moscow. Admittedly, he briefly mentioned Amnesty International as the source. Then the figure was quoted by a French journalist in an account of his trip to the Soviet Union. This time the article said Amnesty International had the figure from information supplied by the USSR Deputy Procurator-General.

On June 12, 1977, on the eve of the Belgrade Meeting of the representatives of the Helsinki Final Act co-signatories, *The New York Times Magazine* wrote that the number of "political

prisoners in the USSR is now estimated to be 10,000". This closed the circle of misinformation.

All Religious Believers Are Persecuted

As we have already explained, "prisoners of conscience" is the term Amnesty International has coined to denote the victims of "official intolerance of freedom of conscience in the USSR". Amnesty International distinguishes between the prisoners of conscience convicted for "political offences" and those convicted for "religious offences". The notion of a "religious offence" has also been invented and circulated by Amnesty International.

What is a "religious offence"? What kind of people are convicted for "religious offences" in the Soviet Union?

In a typically categorical manner Amnesty International answers: "Soviet law provides for the imprisonment of religious believers for their religious activity". Consequently, if "religious activity" entails legal punishment, this activity constitutes a "religious offence".

What Amnesty International is doing in its Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR is "acquainting" the reader with both the practices and the corresponding legislation. The Report contains a special chapter entitled "Freedom of Religions".

From the very start, in describing the legal basis of the activity of religious organisations and the legal status of religious believers in the USSR, Amnesty International proceeds from the misinterpretation of the meaning of the constitutional provisions on freedom of conscience. The main defect of Amnesty International's approach

to interpreting legal matters is misunderstanding or, rather, consciously distorting the essence of freedom of conscience in the USSR as proclaimed and guaranteed by the Soviet Constitution.

In Marxist understanding, freedom of conscience implies non-interference by the state in the sphere of personal freedom and secures for every citizen freedom to choose between professing and not professing a religion. If a citizen professes a faith, it is his absolute right to choose any religious denomination. The citizens are equally entitled to engage in religious worship and atheistic propaganda.

The freedom of conscience, in the understanding of the Soviet legislator, is organically linked to the idea of equality, i.e. the absence of any discrimination on the grounds of the citizen's (be he a believer or a non-believer) attitude to religion.

Accordingly, Article 52 of the USSR Constitution reads: "Citizens of the USSR are guaranteed freedom of conscience, that is, the right to profess or not to profess any religion, and to conduct religious worship or atheistic propaganda. Incitement of hostility or hatred on religious grounds is prohibited.

"In the USSR, the church is separated from the state, and the school from the church."

One of the revolutionising acts of the young Soviet state was the publication on January 23, 1918 of the Decree on the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church signed by Lenin. For the first time the equality of all citizens irrespective of their attitude to religion was laid down in a decree: "Each citizen is entitled to profess any religion or not to profess any." As we see, this decree contained a prototype of the Constitution's

language on freedom of conscience. The Decree proclaimed that "any deprivation of rights on the basis of professing any one religion or professing none is abolished". Thereby the Decree also provided for the equality of all religions and cancelled those privileges of the Orthodox believers over the non-Orthodox ones which existed in the Russian Empire.

However, Amnesty International, contrary to the legal norms, practices and common sense, and in defiance of well-known facts, repeats time and again: all religious believers are persecuted. The tendentious, biased and unsubstantiated nature of this allegation of the defenders of faith from Amnesty International is revealed by comparing it with what Metropolitan Yuvenaliy of Krutitsy and Kolomna, an authoritative expert in church life in the USSR, has to say on the matter.

Speaking on the equality before the law of all the religious believers, churches and religious associations in the USSR, Metropolitan Yuvenaliy says: "Article 52 of the Soviet Constitution grants and guarantees the Soviet citizens freedom of conscience, and the right to profess any religion and observe any religious rite. The same article declares that in the USSR the excitation of hostility or hatred on religious grounds is prohibited. As a hierarch of the Russian Orthodox Church, I can illustrate the way this law is translated into life in the country by the example of my own Church....

"The life of the Russian Orthodox Church is guided, in keeping with its canonical structure, by His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia together with our hierarchs, which in everyday life is expressed in the governing functions of the Holy Synod and in its ultimate manifestation—in those of the local Council. Thou-

sands of Orthodox parishes are spiritually guided by the pastors devoted to the Church, who have obtained their secondary and higher theological education in our theological schools, colleges and academies. The monasteries and convents maintain the traditions of monastic life. Our Church has its own publishing house. Our Church maintains broad brotherly ties with other local Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches and non-Orthodox religious associations. The Russian Orthodox Church is a member of many international organisations, including the World Council of Churches and the Conference of European Churches."

The following statement by Metropolitan Yuvenaliy sounds very convincing: "Similar things can be said by the representatives of other Churches and religious associations in our country about their own life and activities."

What other churches and religious associations does Metropolitan Yuvenaliy have in mind? In the USSR, apart from the Russian Orthodox Church, operative are the following churches and religious associations: the Georgian Orthodox Church, headed by the Catholicos-Patriarch of Georgia, the Archbishop of Mtskheta and Tbilisi; the Armenian Church, headed by the Supreme Patriarch-Catholicos of All Armenians; the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians-Baptists, the Old-Believers' Archbishopric of Moscow and All Russia, the Archbishopric of Novozybkov, Moscow and All Russia of the Old Orthodox Christian Believers, the Consistory of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia, and of Estonia and the Roman-Catholic Church in Lithuania and Latvia.

This list of religious associations and centres is not an exhaustive one. One can also mention the four independent Muslim Boards (of Central

Asia and Kazakhstan; of the European USSR and Siberia; of the Northern Caucasus; and of Transcaucasia) and the Central Spiritual Board of the USSR Buddhists. By tradition, the Judaist communities of the 180 synagogues are not united under a single authority. Also operative in the Soviet Union are the Church Council of the Methodist Church, the Reformed Church of Trans-Carpathia, the Church of the Seventh-Day Adventists and other religious associations.

Such is the truth about the organisation and the activity of religious associations in the USSR. Against this background, Amnesty International's pronouncements sound especially ridiculous. Consider for instance the following maxim from the Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: "It is common for Russian Orthodox religious believers to be confined to psychiatric hospitals and to be told by government officials and psychiatrists that religious belief is a symptom of mental illness."

The revelations of this kind give an idea of the true value of "information" picked up in Samizdat materials recognised by Amnesty International as its main source.

The assessment of the Soviet legislation on religious associations given in Amnesty International's Report is biased and primitive.

To begin with, Amnesty International distorts the essence of the basic normative document determining the legal status of religious associations.

As is known, in force in the Russian Federation is the Decree on Religious Associations adopted in 1929 by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee and the RSFSR Council of People's Commissars and amended in 1975 by the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The matter of religious association is within

the terms of reference of the legislature of the constituent republics of the Soviet Union. For instance, in 1976 the Ukrainian legislature adopted the Regulations on Religious Associations in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

According to Amnesty International, the Decree on Religious Associations encroaches upon the activity of religious congregations and the freedom of conscience of religious believers and provides for many ways of the state authorities' interference in the activity of any congregation in order to stop it completely.

Amnesty International, by expounding the essence of the law in such a tendentious and inaccurate way, seeks to avoid informing the reader of the fact that the legislation on religious associations establishes their legal status, i.e. clearly defines their competence.

Thus, Article 10 of the Regulations on Religious Associations in the Ukrainian SSR stipulates that

"The believers united in a religious association have the right to:

- a) perform religious rites and ceremonies, hold prayer and organisational meetings;
- b) have a free use of a house of worship and articles of worship under the resolution adopted by the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers;
- c) rent for prayer meetings a building (premises), from individual citizens or the Executive Committee of a Regional or City Soviet of Working People's Deputies;
- d) hire or elect ministers of worship;
- e) collect voluntary donations in the prayer house and raise funds, on a voluntary basis, among the members of the given religious association for the purposes of maintaining the house of worship and church property, hiring ministers of

worship and for other purposes provided for by the Regulations;

f) arrange deals related to the maintenance and use of the church property: contracts for the supply of fuel, the repairs of the house of worship and church property, the purchase of foodstuffs and other items used in religious rites, ceremonies and other actions directly associated with the doctrine and ritual of the given religion; engaging the serving staff. The above deals shall not cover contractual relations pursuing the goals of commerce or production;

g) acquire church equipment, articles of worship, means of transportation; rent, construct and buy buildings for their needs in accordance with the legally established procedure;

h) convene, with the permission of the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers, religious congresses and conferences;

i) use seals, letter-heads and forms...

j) open accounts in the local offices of the USSR State Bank."

What are religious organisations not entitled to do?

The legislation stipulates that they "may not engage in any activity other than the satisfaction of the religious needs of the believers". Religious associations may not set up co-operative societies or production associations, organise special children's, youth, women's prayer or other gatherings; organise general biblical, literary, religious-instruction or other similar meetings, groups, circles, children's playgrounds, open libraries, organise medical aid; store literature other than that necessary for religious worship in the house of worship. While the Regulations permit *voluntary* donation and collection, they prohibit collecting *obligatory* dues

and levies. It is also forbidden to take coercive or punitive measures against the believers.

We shall not expound all the details of the legal regulation of the procedure of contracting for the free use of a house of worship or church property, leasing buildings or premises for the needs of religious associations, constructing new houses of worship.

The granting of legal recognition to a religious association is expressed in its being registered. Registration is decided upon by the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers.

In a word, the status of a religious association is determined legally, in an orderly, precise and detailed manner, all aspects of securing actual freedom of conscience being provided for by the law.

As we see, the Soviet legislator does in no way meddle with the activity of religious associations or the satisfaction of religious needs of the believers.

Equally unsupported are the attempts to prove that the provisions of Lenin's Decree of January 23, 1918 on the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church have been "cancelled" by subsequent legislation. The Decree embodies Lenin's concept of the socialist state's attitude to religion and the religious beliefs of the citizens. This concept has been elaborated on and laid down in the Soviet Constitution. We should like to remind the defenders of those who peruse Lenin's wording of the Decree in a bid to find loopholes for opposing the state recognition of freedom of conscience to the interests of religion that Article 6 of the Decree signed by Lenin reads: "No one may evade his civil duty for religious reasons."

What Amnesty International's Report says

about punishment inflicted on those who attempt to publish religious literature is ludicrous.

Amnesty International starts with a general premise: "All publishing in the USSR is done either by state agencies or with official permission, and religious groups are allowed to publish very little. Religious groups of all denominations complain of chronic shortages of copies of the Bible, and the authorities frequently confiscate the religious literature they do have."

Then Amnesty International specifies that the shortage is especially severe for Baptist believers. In 1971 they established a publishing house called The Christian. As a result, all those who participated in the efforts to "satisfy the believers' demands for religious literature" were arrested and sentenced to imprisonment.

That is the story told by Amnesty International. How do the matters stand in reality? We shall illustrate this by citing the example of religious publications undertaken by Baptist believers and the reprinting of the Bible in the USSR, since these questions seem to have been of the greatest concern to the authors of Amnesty International's Report.

The Union of Evangelical Christians-Baptists (UECB) is diversified in its activity as a publisher. Its All-Union Council undertook the publication of the Bible in 1968 and 1979. The 1979 edition of the canonical version of *The Bible—The Canonical Books of the Holy Scripture—The Old and New Testaments* was printed to the UECB's order by Leningrad Sokolov Printing House No.2 of the USSR State Committee for Publishing, Printing and the Book Trade on top-quality paper provided by the state. The UECB publishes a periodical entitled *Brotherly Herald* and regularly undertakes various other religious publications.

What happened to the so-called publishing house The Christian founded by a group of Baptists seeking to repudiate the binding force of the Soviet laws, that is, the rules of conduct prescribed by the Soviet State?

The authors of Amnesty International's Report mention four Baptists who were tried for printing religious literature in the town of Ivangorod.

To begin with, it should be clarified that the printing presses of The Christian publishing house produced religious literature largely as a cover for fabricating leaflets that urged non-observance of laws and distorted the attitude of the Soviet State to religion and religious associations, as well as various other subversive materials discrediting the political system in the USSR.

On November 25, 1977 the Leningrad Region Court did pass a sentence on the four sectarians who had run the illegal printing press in the house of a certain David Koop in Ivangorod. David Koop, Ivan Leven and the sisters Lyudmila and Larissa Zaitsev were found guilty of printing and disseminating leaflets and other materials deliberately distorting realities and instigating civil disobedience.

In the publications produced by The Christian the name of God was used to intimidate the believers who continued "to conform, albeit partly, to the criminal legislation".

Typically, the material published by one M.I. Khorev in *The Herald of the Truth* is entitled "Sacred Disobedience". Khorev equates the observance of the law with being "unfaithful to God". Compliance with secular laws, he says, blasts all hopes for eternal life. The message boils down to the maxim: "law-abidingness is incompatible with serving God as prescribed by the Gospels."

The authors of illegally published leaflets lay special emphasis on setting the believers against registration, i.e. the legally established procedure of assuming the status of a religious association. Thus *Brotherly Herald* urged its readers to counteract those who agree to register and open their houses of worship according to the procedure established by the law. They referred to such opposition as a "deed pleasing to God".

Another characteristic of such leaflets is the slanderous distortion of Soviet realities. Lies about Christians being imprisoned and executed for their "uncompromising service to God" have been published in different versions. In these writings downright slander mingles with exaltation and dramatisation. Frequent allusions to biblical legends and the fate of Christ's followers "doomed to martyrdom" are calculated to inflame the believers with religious fanaticism.

To make the tales about the position of religious believers in the USSR sound more dramatic, their authors cite passages from Exodus on the cruelty of Pharaoh towards the sons of Israel, or from the Gospel according to St. Matthew on Herod and his slaying all the children in Bethlehem, or tell the story of the Christians whom Nero threw to the lions.

One must suffer from hallucinations to write that "in our time, the people who call themselves atheists, who wield power and the sword and blaze with relentless hatred make every effort to traumatise and destroy people, to take little children away from their mothers". It takes delirious fantasy to create myths about "hundreds of thousands of children dying of starvation, epidemics, and being transplanted to the snows of Siberia".

This absurd piling up of horrors is designed to train fanatical sectarians to obedience to those

"spiritual preceptors" who preach "sacred disobedience" to secular laws as conduct "pleasing to God".

The self-styled "heralds" seek to cultivate anti-state Utopianism. The author of one of the leaflets circulated among the Baptists questions: "May we, the Christians, in our wandering before Our Lord, abide by the laws issued by humans?" And answers: "No. We wish to live only according to the laws of Our Lord."

Thus the ridiculous thesis that the life style of a true believer rules out conformity to the laws enacted by the state is instilled in the mind of the believer.

It stands to reason that from the point of view of the state overt and organised instigation to deliberate disobedience to the law is inadmissible, especially if it is cloaked in pseudo-religious phraseology and fosters fanaticism.

As for the purely legal aspects of such activity, it should be borne in mind that the authors of writings instigating disobedience to the law are fully aware of the fact that their deliberate actions are punishable under the Criminal Code. In 1966, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, by way of interpreting the law, explained that "the production with the purpose of mass dissemination or the mass dissemination of appeals, letters, leaflets and other documents calling to non-observance of the legislation on religious worship" is punishable under Article 142 of the RSFSR Criminal Code.¹

¹ Article 142, covering violations of the laws on the separation of the church from the state and the school from the church, provides for punishment ranging from a fine of up to fifty roubles to a corrective labour term of up to twelve months. It is only a repeated commission of the crime offence that entails imprisonment for a term of up to three years.

That the dissemination (and the preparations for further dissemination) of instigative materials which only Amnesty International can refer to as "religious literature" did actually take place was also corroborated by finding seven tons of stolen paper in the printing plant installed in D.Koop's house in Ivangorod.

Misinformation for the Sake of Provocation

Five September days of 1980 will always be a bright page in the history of the public movement to defend the basic human rights: the right to life and the right to peace. From September 23 to September 27 Sofia was the seat of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace. 2,260 envoys from 137 countries gathered in the capital of Bulgaria to express the will of their peoples by declaring: "War is not inevitable! Peace can be preserved and strengthened!" At a troublous and uneasy moment in the development of international relations the delegates adopted a Charter of the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace outlining the principal tasks of the peace-loving forces in our time.

The authorised representatives of all continents got together to discuss the most urgent problem of today, that of safeguarding peace and protecting humanity against another war.

Among the prominent public figures and politicians who participated in the work of the World Parliament were 215 parliamentarians from many countries, 210 trade union leaders, the representatives of 106 international organisations including 18 representatives of UN bodies, specialised agencies, committees and commissions. There were also delegates of more than

300 political parties and organisations and of 33 national liberation movements.

The deliberations were marked by the combination of elevated inspiration and common sense, deep concern and sober approach. All the issues, among them many-sided and broad ones, were discussed in the light of the pivotal subject—the ways of ensuring the right to peace, national independence, freedom and social progress. The World Parliament provided for the consideration of negative developments threatening the peace and freedom of nations.

Sofia's largest hall, *Universiada*, was the seat of a special sitting where cases of outrageous, large-scale violations of human rights and crime against humanity were heard. Prominent lawyers and public figures gave evidence concerning crimes committed by the Chinese aggressors in Vietnam and by the Pol Pot regime in Kampuchea. Many of those who themselves had been victims of terror in Haiti, El Salvador, Guatemala, Chile, Uruguay and Paraguay testified to the mass repressions in their countries. Evidence disclosed the Israeli authorities' criminal acts of humiliation and desecration with respect to the Arab people of Palestine in the occupied territories. Ample proof showed the British military forces to be guilty of numerous crimes in Northern Ireland.

Among those who came to Sofia was Cecile Rolin from the Belgian section of Amnesty International. Cecile Rolin and her two assistants expected to attract the attention of the World Parliament by coming out as human rights champions.

Curiously enough, Cecile Rolin's voice was not heard in the *Universiada* hall where irrefutable proofs of crimes were cited, grim stories of killings and massacre were told by eye-witnesses,

and photographed documents testifying to atrocities, torture, violence and desecration were shown.

The delegates decided to consider the issue of racism and other forms of discrimination in an *ad hoc* commission. More than fifty speakers condemned all forms of racism, including apartheid. They stressed that race discrimination tramples upon the dignity and equality of all people, violates the UN Charter and defies numerous documents of international law. The reactionary, fascist, Zionist and imperialist circles seeking to perpetuate racism make every effort to separate people and create flashpoints of tension, conflict and clashes dangerous to peace.

The speakers condemned the ideology and practice of apartheid in the Republic of South Africa, and expressed their concern over the escalation of racism in the United States, Great Britain and Canada. The representation of West European countries adduced numerous facts testifying to discrimination against immigrant workers.

The intervention by Cecile Rolin struck a sharply discordant note. Without beating about the bush, and also without citing any facts or proofs, she proposed to condemn the Soviet Union for abiding by the policy of racism vis-a-vis all the non-Russian nationalities!

Soon after her intervention, when she sensed that instead of being supported, she was only going to hear angry voices stigmatising her for outrageous provocation, Cecile Rolin left the hall. I, as well as many other delegates, had to respond to her allegations in her absence.

The Soviet representative said, in particular, that the resolute support to the struggle against racism in all its forms and manifestations, ranging from fascism and apartheid, through the well-disguised hypocrisy of bourgeois elitism to

the Ku Klux Klan and the arrogance of Zionism, is organically linked to the ideology, policy and practice of absolute equality of all the peoples in the Soviet Union.

Among the audience there was another Soviet delegate, an Uzbek Professor Rais Tuzmukhamedov, Doctor of Law. Before the October Revolution, 98 per cent of the Uzbeks were illiterate. Today there are 2,000 Uzbek professors among Soviet scientists and lecturers in the higher educational establishments. This alone is enough to disprove Cecile Rolin's slander.

In Sofia we met another delegate from Belgium, Raoul Baligand, President of the Independence Front (Front de l'Independance, a member organisation of FIR, the International Federation of Resistance Fighters). Mr. Baligand and I had once visited a sorrowful place in Belgium, Fort Brendongk, which in the years of occupation was turned into a Nazi torture-chamber. The gallows has not been removed from the fort, now a national memorial, in order to remind the present and the future generations of the grave danger of racism, violence, aggression, fascism and war.

Madam Rolin and her associates should remember that Soviet people, true internationalists, who perceive racial and national equality as an organic element of their social existence, have pure hearts and clear conscience. As such, Soviet delegates shook hands with Jim Jackson, the representative of Black Americans struggling against racism in the USA, Musa Mula from the Republic of South Africa who represented the African National Congress, and Ahmad, a representative of the Arab people of Palestine and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation.

As for the representative of Amnesty International, Cecile Rolin, her intervention was taken

as a downright provocation, an attempt to divert the public's attention from the topical problems of real concern to the world's peoples.

Amnesty International demonstrated to the delegates at the World Parliament of the Peoples for Peace its method of "dispersed provocation". The method implies that the actions designed by Amnesty International are performed by the people from its national sections. Moreover, according to this method, slanderous attacks are at times aimed at less important targets in order to provoke confusion and detract attention from major issues.

WHO IS DEFENDED BY AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL AND WHO IS NOT?

The Mythical Engineer, Michael Haugk

Has anyone ever heard about Michael Haugk from Karl-Marx-Stadt? About his having been arrested on March 16, 1978 for criticising the electoral system and the foreign policy of the GDR? And about his having been sentenced, on August 22, 1978, by the Karl-Marx-Stadt court of law to three years and eight months of imprisonment for incitement against the state?

No one would have ever learned anything about the engineer Michael Haugk from Karl-Marx-Stadt, had Amnesty International not started demonstrating its "concern" for him. This time the philanthropic action was entrusted to Amnesty International's French section.

Amnesty International's bodies, national sections and local groups are all highly vociferous when expressing, in the name of "supreme philanthropic ideas", their concern over each case of hypothetical conviction of a "prisoner of conscience" in the socialist countries. They file petitions, circulate letters, hold press conferences. And all this to substantiate the myth about political persecution in the socialist countries with "concrete facts".

In the case of "the engineer Haugk" letters were addressed to Minister of Justice, Chairman of the Supreme Court, and Chairman of the State Council of the GDR. Copies were sent to the newspapers and circulated throughout the world.

Thus, the myth about political persecution in the East Germany was carried on.

Finally, on March 12, 1980 the spokesman for Amnesty International's French section made a statement to the effect that his organisation was in possession of "reliable information" on a case of human rights violation in East Germany. This set in motion the flywheel of investigations into the GDR's violation of Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaiming freedom of opinion and expression.

Amnesty International's spokesmen might have made many more big statements on that score, but for one circumstance. East Germany's competent government bodies officially confirmed that no one of the name of Michael Haugk had ever been tried in the GDR. Moreover, no one of that name had ever lived in Karl-Marx-Stadt. And no trial is known to have taken place on August 22, 1978.

"The Haugk case" burst like a soap-bubble.

It only remains to ask: what was it all about: was it "an act of philanthropy" on the part of Amnesty International or one of its usual political provocations?

"Pardon the Executioners!"

On October 26, 1941, mass arrests swept the town of Mirgorod (the Ukraine). The Nazis and their lickspittles, traitors who had enlisted in the German police, arrested Soviet citizens of Jewish origin. The arrested were told to take all their most valuable things with them, since they were going to be "resettled". They were rounded up in the market place which had been fenced off. On the 28th of October they were formed into a column and taken by convoy

to the northern suburb of the town. The Nazi soldiers and the Polizei, their Alsatians leaping and barking, hurried women, young children and old people along Gogol street, pushing them on with the butts of their submachine-guns and swearing.

By the prison, a group of local functionaries and activists was added to the column. Another group, consisting of ten wounded POWs, was led out of the former college building.

When the column approached the anti-tank ditch, the Nazis and the Polizei started to tear off people's outer clothing and take away their things. Then they shot all of them.

The anti-tank ditch in the northern suburb of Mirgorod became a common grave for two hundred people. Many of the town's most respected citizens and whole families were killed there.

Among the executioners were five members of the Polizei, five traitors: Fyodor Pelikh, Ivan Mamchich, Nikolai Petrenko, Andrei Derevyanko and Pavel Ksyonz.

For a long time after the Mirgorod massacre they continued to assist the Nazi killers. While combing the neighbouring villages they captured twenty Jews who had miraculously escaped the massacre of October 28. The captives were tortured in the town prison for a whole month. Then, half-dead, they were thrown on a sled, taken to the same anti-tank ditch on the outskirts of the town and shot.

The Polizei Mamchich testified: "Some of them could not walk. They were dragged along and then shot." When asked if they were all adults, he said: "There were children, too."

By the end of that year the five Polizei had captured thirty patriots out of those many who resisted the Nazis in the countryside. They were shot in the playground of School No.4.

This does not exhaust the list of atrocities committed by the five. They went on killing, torturing and robbing.

According to the statement issued on May 20, 1944 by the Extraordinary State Commission of Enquiry into the crimes committed by the Nazi invaders and their accomplices, during the temporary occupation of Mirgorod by the enemy, 513 Soviet citizens, including 28 children and 23 old people over 70, were put to death; 370 of them were shot by the anti-tank ditch and in the playground of School No.4.

When the Nazis were routed, the five policemen who had assisted them in the crimes perpetrated in Mirgorod did their best to cover up their tracks. Although they forged their papers and lived under false names, they were finally tracked down and, on the basis of irrefutable evidence, convicted of atrocious crimes.

The trial, at which 120 witnesses gave evidence, was held in Mirgorod from June 26 to July 9, 1979. The court was presented with the documents seized from the Germans, the conclusions of medical experts and the results of ballistic examination. The trial was given wide coverage by the press.

Ksyonz, Derevyanko, Pelikh, Mamchich and Petrenko were sentenced to be shot. The exceptional penalty was generally recognised as fair and approved by the people in Mirgorod and elsewhere.

Amnesty International, however, disapproved of the verdict. It decided to "adopt" the convicted executioners and demanded to annul the sentence.

Admittedly, the five traitors and executioners were tried not in 1945, but in 1979. But could their guilt have shrunk with time?

Is it really just to punish someone so severely for a crime committed a long time ago?

Soviet legislation takes a firm stand on this matter. Soviet law expresses the will of the people, their feeling for law and order and their sense of justice. The Soviet people honour the memory of the war heroes. The often repeated words "Nobody is forgotten, nothing is forgotten" express their conviction that acts of heroism should be remembered for ever, while base crimes and inhumanity should never be forgiven.

This position is shared by international law under which statutory limitations are not to be applied to the crimes perpetrated by the Nazi war criminals and their accessories.

This posture is of great legal and moral significance.

The victory over Nazism made possible the restoration of human rights which had been trampled upon by the Nazis. In order to restore genuine respect for human dignity, ensure the authority of law and ethics, and prevent the repeated commission of crimes against peace and humanity, all those guilty of grave war crimes must be punished.

The war against the Nazis was still on when the idea of the inevitability of punishment for all Nazi criminals was formulated and proclaimed in international legal documents.

In a declaration on punishment for the crimes committed during the war, adopted on January 13, 1942, the governments in the anti-Nazi coalition voiced their determination to take all the necessary measures to bring to justice and prosecute the war criminals and to ensure that the sentences be enforced. In the Moscow Declaration on War Crimes issued on October 30, 1943, the heads of governments of the USSR, the USA and Great Britain on behalf of 32 states warned the perpetrators of war crimes that they would be

found even at the world's end and handed over to prosecutors so that justice be done.

After the war, the four great powers reiterated their unflinching stand on the punishment of war criminals in a number of documents they adopted. The Potsdam Accords stipulated that "the war criminals and those who participated in the planning and perpetration of the Nazi actions which entailed or resulted in atrocities or war crimes must be arrested and prosecuted".

The precept of inevitability of punishment for the Nazi criminals is organically linked to the non-applicability of statutory limitations to war crimes. It has been repeatedly pointed out that punishing war criminals would guard humanity against the recurrence of the horrors and crimes of Nazism.

On November 26, 1968, the 23rd Session of the UN General Assembly adopted a Convention on the Non-Applicability of Statutory Limitations to war crimes and crimes against humanity. The Convention, to which twenty states are parties, came into force on December 11, 1970.

There cannot and must not exist temporal restrictions hampering the detection, prosecution and punishment of the war criminals.

Just as the years cannot erase from the memory of the victims of Nazism and those who lost their nearest and dearest the agony they suffered, so, no matter how much time passes, there can be no moral or legal justification for pardoning those who are guilty of war crimes.

Such is the stand taken by the peoples who suffered from the Nazi crimes. Their stand is supported by the democratic world public. Nonetheless, the defenders of Nazi criminals, feigning humanity and compassion, seek pardon for the executioners who have never had anything human about them.

Attempts are often made to deny that a certain Nazi crime has actually been perpetrated. This manner of protecting Nazi criminals is often closely linked to the apology of neo-fascism. Thus, the demands to apply statutory limitations to the Nazi criminals, or to plead compassion and mercy for them play into the hands of the revanchists.

Amnesty International revolts against the truly democratic and human position of those who demand punishment for the war criminals. Pardoning the executioners, the butchers who massacred thousands of innocent people, including old people, women and children, would mean repudiation of humanity and making mockery of the memory of the victims of Nazism and of the feelings of those who still mourn their nearest and dearest killed tens of years ago.

The "humaneness" advocated by Amnesty International is completely false. This pseudo-humaneness is manifested in the attempts to urge the application of statutory limitations to crimes against peace and humanity and to war crimes on the plea of opposing capital punishment. Amnesty International distorts the true meaning of the Decree issued by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on March 4, 1965 On Punishing the Persons Guilty of Crimes against Peace and Humanity and War Crimes, Irrespective of the Time They Were Committed. This Decree provides, as an exception to the general rules of the law in force, for the admissibility of a just punishment of those who perpetrated grave war crimes in the period of the 1941-45 Great Patriotic War, even if they were detected after the established time of criminal prosecution and criminal punishment had expired.

The Decree of March 4, 1965 stipulates that the Nazis guilty of grave crimes against peace and

humanity and war crimes are to be prosecuted and punished no matter how much time has passed since these crimes were perpetrated. The Decree also applies to those Soviet citizens who, acting as accomplices and accessories of the Nazi criminals during the 1941-45 Great Patriotic War, participated in punitive expeditions, in killing and torturing Soviet people.

Amnesty International seeks to propagate the idea of granting universal amnesty to the Nazi criminals. In essence, this constitutes an anti-historic attempt to make the peoples of the world consign atrocious crimes to oblivion and pardon those who must never be acquitted. Amnesty International's attempts to plead for the criminals are especially hideous when it undertakes to vindicate concrete Nazi murderers or their lickspittles.

Imagine a Nazi creature, an executioner, sitting on a low stool by his machine-gun, taking a rest while still another group of people, stripped naked, is being drawn up in front of him. The victims wait while the executioner sips from a bottle he keeps at his side. This is a scene from the Holocaust, a film that shook everybody who saw it, including British TV viewers. It is most likely that among the latter were at least some of Amnesty International's functionaries.

Here is an excerpt from the examination record of another executioner, A. Makarova, a woman: "The only thing that differed was the number of prisoners. The rest was the same all the time: I was ordered to shoot a group of people, my machine-gun was wheeled out to where the execution was to take place, I would take off my greatcoat, lie down or kneel by the machine-gun and fire until all of them fell."

While she was shooting, German officers took

photographs. Once they brought their general with them, so as he could admire the scene and take a snap, too. Wasn't it a rare, if not a unique, phenomenon: a female executioner? Indeed, it was a unique case of moral degradation, extraordinary and all the more appalling in its unnaturalness.

During the war Soviet women were equal in heroism and staunchness to Soviet men. Their deeds as soldiers and partisans, and as workers on the home front have been glorified. And still, there is no hymn to express all the profundity of the people's gratitude to the ones who, having bidden farewell to their husbands and sons leaving for the front, lived through the hard times alone, raising the children and doing man's jobs at the factories and on the farms.

Indeed, Makarova, who hired herself out to Nazi murderers, who volunteered for executions, who forfeited all that had been womanly about her, represents a truly extraordinary case of hideous degradation.

She lived in Lokot, a settlement in the Bryansk Region, famous for its trotter-breeding stud-farm. During the war, the Nazis turned the stud-farm into a huge torture-chamber where hundreds of Soviet patriots suffered anguish.

When the Nazis were routed, Makarova, or Tonka the Machine-gunner, hated by all the people in the neighbourhood, made for East Prussia. She managed to cover up her tracks and it was not until 1979 that she was found and prosecuted.

She was tried by the Bryansk regional law court. Confronted with irrefutable evidence, she confessed to having participated in torturing and executing Soviet people. In particular, she testified to having tortured wounded partisans in the local prison and being personally responsible for the execution of no less than one hundred patriots.

Makarova was sentenced to death.

This was an exceptional punishment. Exceptional, but proportionate and warranted. No one could describe it other than just. The RSFSR Supreme Court did not deem it necessary to commute the sentence. The plea for mercy was declined by the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Amnesty International was the only one to stand up for the criminal. Can anything be more sacrilegious than its call: "Pardon the executioner!"

By and large, Amnesty International is known for its soft-hearted attitude to the Nazi criminal of all grades. Take for example the case of Rudolf Hess.

Rudolf Hess, Hitler's deputy in the Nazi Party, Minister of the Imperial Government, Privy Councillor, member of the Council of Ministers for Imperial Defence was condemned by the International Military Tribunal as one of the leaders of the Nazi regime and sentenced to imprisonment for life.

Hess's four years in Great Britain saved his life. The Soviet lawyer and publicist, A. Poltorak, a participant in and the chronicler of the Nuremberg trial, wrote that the Nuremberg Tribunal had obviously taken into consideration the fact that, living outside Germany since 1941, Hess could not participate personally in the grave crimes perpetrated in these years. However, Hess deserves a death sentence for all he had committed before he fled to Great Britain.

Hess has not been executed. But this is not the point. His crimes have been condemned and his name has been accursed for ever. He is serving his sentence in Berlin's Spandau Prison, where the seven Nazi criminals convicted by the International Military Tribunal were confined. Hess is the last to remain in Spandau.

This last circumstance was used by Amnesty International as a pretext for launching a campaign to release Hess from prison. The argument was that, being the only prisoner in Spandau, he cannot communicate with other prisoners and has to serve a life term of single confinement, which is inhuman and degrading.

We are not going to carry on polemics with Rudolf Hess's guardians from Amnesty International on whether a punishment meted out for a Nazi war criminal guilty of having been among those who headed a political system, which entailed the death of millions of people and genocide and jeopardized the very existence of civilisation, can be excessively cruel.

We shall only note that from the very start, since the day he was brought to the Spandau prison where, according to the decision of the International Military Tribunal, he was to be kept for life, Hess has been serving his sentence in a solitary cell.

It is noteworthy that in demanding Hess's release his Amnesty International trustees act from the positions also shared by the blunt Nazis and their sympathisers in West Germany and other West European countries.

While reaching for its goal, Amnesty International tries to insinuate that Hess would have long been set at large, had it not been for the Soviet Union's intractability.

As we see, Amnesty International, an organisation claiming impartiality and abstention from participation in politics, continuously gambles on crude anti-Sovietism. In the case of Rudolf Hess it is trading on the anti-Sovietism of the neo-fascists.

The attempts to urge the release of Rudolf Hess are futile. The world public opinion supports the Soviet Union's "intransigent" position.

The horrible lesson of the Second World War is a constant reminder that no one, Amnesty International included, should attempt to revise the verdict brought in by the Peoples' Tribunal in Nuremberg in its entirety or in its part (no matter how insignificant) either *de jure* or *de facto*.

Amnesty International's Rules Do Not Apply to a Victim of Terror

The Uruguayan student Helena Beatriz Vasilkis Castro (1953) was arrested at her mother's place on June 4, 1972. During the three months she was kept in the La Paloma barracks she was excruciatingly tortured: hung by the arms, subjected to electric shock, horribly beaten. The torturers would press burning cigarettes to her breasts and hold her head under water. They wanted her to sign a statement to the effect that while training for a teacher's career, "she planned to introduce Marxist ideas in public education".

Then she was thrown into Cabildo, a women's jail. By the end of her fourth year in prison, in August 1977, she was transferred to Punta de Rieles. She is still there, in section "C" of the jail, and her identification number is 433. The military court of first instance sentenced her to 28 years of imprisonment and additional 10 years of "special mode of residence", on the charge of "violating the Constitution" and "maintaining contacts with the criminal world". In 1980 a military court of last resort prolonged the term of imprisonment to 30 years. At the age of thirty, Helena Beatriz Vasilkis Castro is an invalid. As the result of tortures and the inhuman conditions of confine-

ment, she has lost her hearing, is suffering from the disturbance of blood circulation in her hands and arms (Rheinod's disease) and a gum disease, caused by decalcification. She is denied any medicine.

In his efforts to save his sister's life, Sergio Vasilskis, who has managed to escape from the hell of military-fascist terror and is now living in France, turned to various international organisations.

In despair, he also applied for help to Amnesty International. Enquiries were made and it was found out that Helena Beatriz was charged with "Marxist subversion". This was enough for Amnesty International to refuse to "accept the dossier of Helena Beatriz Vasilskis Castro".

Indeed, Amnesty International's rules do not apply to the victims of military-fascist terror, especially if they are charged with "Marxist activities".

It is some very special kind of "impartiality" and "objectivity" that makes Amnesty International avoid pleading the cause of the actual victims of mass human rights violations in those cases when its bosses are not interested in the exposure of political terror.

What can be more terrible than the fate of the Ulster patriots continuously facing brutal Government reprisals? British authorities have turned Northern Ireland into a kind of training and testing ground to coach the members of punitive expeditions and test repression-oriented police methods and materiel. The punitive measures developed and mastered in this "laboratory" can be subsequently applied on a national scale to suppress all kinds of mass discontent.

This outrageous case of large-scale political repression and resort to torture causes the concern of all people of good will, of all those

who cherish the ideal of civil rights. Amnesty International seems to be the only exception. It appears to be not in the least embarrassed to recognise that it "has adopted no prisoners in Northern Ireland" (see page 311 of Amnesty International's 1980 Report).

A special system of repressive legislation devised to provide a "legal" cover for the wide-scale political terror in Northern Ireland was initiated as early as 1922 by the enforcement of the Special Powers Act passed by the British Parliament as a "provisional" law. The act provided, among other things, for such police measures as whipping the prisoners and keeping them in custody without trial or legal verification of the warrantability of commitment. In 1973, the provisional Special Powers Act was replaced by the Northern Ireland (Emergency Provisions) Act, under which the army and the police may arrest people without warrant and conduct arbitrary searchings and confiscations. One may be detained without a trial for as long as 18 months. The supplementary Prevention of Terrorism Act provides for keeping people in custody for practically unlimited time without bringing charges against them. Numerous cases are known of persons arrested on "suspicion of terrorism" being kept in custody for three years.

Interrogations, usually held in Castlereagh Police Barracks, are accompanied by torture, so as to wrench a "confession" from the detainee. The point is that according to the legal practices established in Northern Ireland a signed confession, even though no details of the crime are supplied, gives enough ground for conviction. As shown by a Queen's University Law Faculty research, between 80 per cent and 92 per cent of all convictions obtained for "terrorist" offences are a result of signed confessions obtained during

the police interrogations. There is ample evidence that the methods employed by the police combine battery and "sophisticated" torture with such barbaric violence as holding the victims in sewage or searing their skin with burning cigarettes. The policemen apply torture and maim their victims with total impunity.

Since 1968 more than two hundred innocent civilians have been killed by the police and the soldiers. None of those guilty of murdering them has been punished.

For a long time now the world public's attention has been riveted on the horrors taking place in the torture-chambers of the Belfast Maze prison's H-block. ("The Maze prison" is the current official name of the Long Kesh concentration camp.) There is abundant evidence of the ill-treatment of more than 400 prisoners confined in this prison.

Amnesty International stands out for its not joining in the world-wide protest and indignation. In its 1980 Report it claimed that it had been unable to verify the information on the ill-treatment in the Maze prison.

In March 1981, Bobby Sands, Francis Hughes, Raymond McCreesh and Patrick O'Hara, confined in the Maze prison, Western Europe's largest jail, went on a hunger strike to protest against violence and humiliation suffered by the political prisoners in Northern Ireland. In May 1981, the four hunger strikers slid into death one after another. They gave up their lives to urge the restoration of the special status of political prisoners for the imprisoned Irish "republicans" which was introduced in 1972 and suspended in 1976. By the autumn of 1981 ten hunger strikers had died.

The world public was stunned by the Maze prison tragedy, by the death of the young patriots

who had opted for the extreme measures in the struggle for the civil rights of the 500,000-strong Irish community.

What was the reaction of Amnesty International? Did it raise its voice in defence of the basic demands advanced by the young political prisoners in Northern Ireland who gave up their lives in order to have these demands satisfied? Amnesty International's response is reflected in its report stating that Amnesty "has adopted no prisoners in Northern Ireland". And all this because of its "impartiality". Indeed, in the case of Amnesty International "impartiality" is a double entendre.

At the same time, one may ask: has Amnesty International never attacked the arbitrary rule and violence the reactionary, among them military-fascist, dictatorships indulge in? Yes, it has. But when? And in what manner?

There were cases when the world public opinion forced Amnesty International's leaders to feign political objectivity by censuring brutal reprisals undertaken, say, by the South Korean dictatorship.

Amnesty International takes trouble to convince its unsophisticated grass-roots activists of their organisation's objectivity and impartiality. In order to disguise the fact that the efforts to spread misinformation are spearheaded against the political system in socialist countries, Amnesty International's leaders sometimes criticise, say, the Chilean dictator Pinochet. When the regime of institutionalised political terror and mass reprisals against the country's democrats launched by Pinochet's military-fascist junta stirred the indignation of the world public, Amnesty International, trying to save its face, published a brochure entitled *Chile: Amnesty International Report*.

The brochure was published a year after the military-fascist junta had seized power. By that time the Pinochet regime had already been condemned by the UN Commission on Human Rights and the Organization of American States. The International Commission of Enquiry into the Crimes of the Military Junta in Chile had already held its plenary sessions in Helsinki and Copenhagen, as well as a number of sessions of its broadened Secretariat, and published a series of documents exposing the crimes committed by the junta and the all-embracing nature of the system of terror it had established.

Amnesty International's brochure covers only a few issues and is restrained in describing large-scale arrests, massacre, violence and torture.

However, Amnesty International's leaders attained their goal: they displayed their "impartiality" and secured for themselves an alibi.

A Peculiar Interpretation of History

The Soviet public thought highly of the Lithuanian film *No One Wanted to Die*. This film recounts the events of the early post-war years when Soviet Lithuania was healing its wounds, rebuilding its towns and readjusting itself to a peaceful and constructive way of life. However, these were troubled times. The Nazi hangers-on, having failed to flee with their masters, were up to mischief. They joined together in small gangs, and hiding in the ruins or in the woods, terrorised the population by raiding hamlets, assaulting and killing those who did honest work building a peaceful life and consolidating the social system the people had opted for.

No one wanted to die, but the bandits went on murdering, maiming, causing ever new wounds. Such is the plot of the film as I, one of the public, remember it.

Antanas Mikalkinas of Siauliai did not want to die as he hurried home after work to join his wife and their three sons, the ten-year-old Leonas, the seven-year-old Edvardas and the five-year-old Antanas.

Antanas Mikalkinas was shot in the street by a bandit who thought he had been recognised. A passer-by was also badly wounded.

The bandit, Balys Gajauskas, an evening-school student, had dropped his studies, armed himself with a pistol and got two others to join him. In early 1948, after they had raided a bar, the police got on the Gajauskas's trail. Gajauskas started looking for reliable "friends". The robbers and thieves in Kaunas welcomed him into their ranks. These bandits posed as defenders of the Lithuanian people's freedom and rights.

When Balys Gajauskas killed a man in the street in Siauliai he was arrested and prosecuted on a charge of robbery and murder.

This is what actually happened; these are real historical events. These facts, one would think, are so irrefutable that they cannot be misinterpreted.

The public cannot fail to be concerned by the recent upsurge of neo-Nazism and the spread, accompanied by the efforts to revise certain historical facts, of the ideology of the most reactionary and aggressive forces. Attempts are persistently made to vindicate the main war criminals of the Hitler Reich. Allegations are made to the effect that the atrocious Nazi crimes have never been committed. For instance, even in France, first an article and then a whole book appeared in which the annihilation of millions

of people in the Nazi gas chambers is denied.

Did the gas chambers really exist?

Were there really such murderers? Did they actually murder honest and innocent people? Or were they defending the independence and the rights of the people?

It turned out that Amnesty International has its own way of interpreting history. In 1980, Amnesty International described Balys Gajauskas's acts of robbery and murder as "participation in Lithuanian resistance to Lithuania's becoming part of the USSR as a result of territorial changes brought about by the Second World War".

Lithuania was proclaimed a Soviet Socialist Republic by the freely elected representatives of the Lithuanian people on July 21, 1940. Lithuania became a constituent republic of the Soviet Union on August 3, 1940, and this could not, therefore, be a result of territorial changes brought about by the Second World War. After the war only a handful of Nazi hangers-on, Nazi collaborators who failed to leave the country together with the retreating German troops, continued to resist Lithuania's being a Soviet Republic. It is noteworthy that, while retreating, the Nazis left behind their recent accomplices they had recruited from among the local traitors: it was a kind of betrayal of the traitors.

Amnesty International portrays the handful of bandits who performed brutal acts of terrorism as "the Lithuanian partisan movement of the late 1940s and early 1950s". We are again faced with a case of a peculiar, so to speak, interpretation of history. This peculiar approach boils down to blasphemous equating of the bandits, primarily former Nazi accomplices recruited among Lithuanian nationalists, to the partisans who heroically fought the enemy on the territory of Soviet Lithuania, temporarily occupied by the

Nazi invaders during the Great Patriotic War.

Over the years, Lithuania has healed its wounds. The three sons of Antanas Mikalkinas, who was murdered by Balys Gajauskas, have grown up. One of them, Edvardas, became a physician who is now head of the out-patient clinic at the Ionav nitrogen fertilizer plant. In 1978, he first saw the murderer of his father.

Balys Gajauskas was tried for a second time. After serving his term, this bandit (or "prisoner of conscience" as he is currently referred to by Amnesty International) took up writing. He decided to describe the "feats" of his partners in robbery, murder, bandit raids and terrorism. Gajauskas collected "materials", drew up lists of "heroes", made a card-index, and composed a "documented" history of "feats". As was established by the court, his writings were of a clearly anti-Soviet nature. First of all, because the bandits were pictured as heroes; secondly, because the actions taken by the Soviet authorities to eliminate the bandits were slanderously described as violence and reprisals against the "heroic fighters for the rights of the Lithuanian people".

By disseminating his "historiographic" writings, Gajauskas tried to slander the Lithuanian people who had put an end to the crimes committed by these despicable bandits.

The "chronicler" Gajauskas decided to glorify the "heroic deeds" of his confederates and partners. Following the stereotyped pattern established by Amnesty International, Gajauskas classifies them as "prisoners of conscience".

The list of "heroes" is headed by Antanas Burbulis and Teodoras Kerza.

Antanas Burbulis hired himself out to the Nazis as early as June 1941. As a lieutenant of the so-called 13th Battalion he was a party to violence and murder. Burbulis is responsible for the death

of many of the inhabitants of the Kaunas ghetto and the prisoners of the notorious IX Fort, among whom were anti-Nazis and Jews abducted from occupied France.

The Nazis charged the 13th Battalion with the massacre of the population of the Dedovichi District of the Pskov Region. Burbulis distinguished himself during this punitive expedition: he put to death 43 inhabitants of the Lithuanian village Uzusaliai who refused to submit to the invaders.

The service record of another hero of Gajauskas's "historiographic" writings, Teodoras Kerza, includes participation in reprisals against the inhabitants of Saukotas, Siluv, Salakas and other towns and settlements in Lithuania, torturing and massacring them. As a cavalry sergeant-major and a member of a punitive squad Kerza took part in a mass execution in Krakes where, on October 5, 1941, 1,500 Soviet citizens, predominantly of Jewish origin, were shot. When the Nazis were routed, Kerza went into hiding and changed his name. It was not until 1963 that Kerza, who then went under the name of Petraitis, was tracked down and prosecuted.

The people whom Gajauskas tried to glorify in his writings by portraying them as heroes and martyrs who had to pay dearly for these "feats", "dictated to them by their conscience", were none other than the accomplices and assistants of the Nazi butchers, who betrayed their own people and who are guilty of grave crimes against humanity.

In fact, Gajauskas reproduced in his writings Amnesty International's formula, according to which the "heroes" who were involved in torture and massacre "participated in the nationalist resistance to Soviet power".

What is especially striking about the whole

affair is that Amnesty International repeatedly emphasises that it recognises as "prisoners of conscience" only those convicts "who have neither used nor advocated violence".

In this context, it will be interesting to recall what Antanas Mikalkinas's son, doctor Edwardas Mikalkinas, told the journalists present at the Gajauskas's trial in 1978: "Today is one of the worst days of my life since I lost my father: I've seen his murderer! What a cynical, totally degraded creature he is. As a doctor, I am embarrassed to say that I am nauseated by the sight of him. I can imagine what brutes his accomplices were when they were armed. Life had taught them nothing. Once a wolf, always a wolf, even in sheep's clothing."

While the bandits shot women in the back of their heads, cut off young girls' breasts, lay in wait for formerly landless farm hands and murdered them because they dared to farm the land allotted to them, they did, at the same time, try to create a certain kind of "ideological cover" for the terror they unleashed. They threw about and pasted on the walls leaflets containing threats and warnings. The bandits, while condemning and slandering the new regime, threatened to kill all those who supported the efforts to build a peaceful life in post-war Lithuania. The threats, alas, were not futile. In court V. Dumbliauskas, one of Gajauskas's "heroes", testified: "Having killed Uliackas, his wife, and Alisauskas, we took Uliackas's horse and cart, cow, calf, and clothes and also Alisauskas's horse, big pig, and clothing. We killed those people because they were loyal to Soviet power."

Among those who fabricated and circulated on the orders of the bandits various leaflets, that is, who participated in vindicating terror, robbery and murder, was a certain Victor Petkus. As

early as 1948 he, as a lad, distributed all sorts of appeals, manifestos and memoranda.

At night, while some of the armed bandits came out of their forest hidings, committed murder and placed explosives, others threw about and pasted leaflets calling for disobedience and non-observance of the law.

When Petkus was tried for the first time, the court took into account that he was a juvenile and agreed with the arguments of the defence that Petkus might have not fully realised the implications of his participation in the crimes committed by inveterate bandits. The court was lenient towards Petkus and passed a comparatively mild sentence.

Evidently, the court was excessively lenient because, once he had served his sentence, Petkus was brought to justice and convicted on similar charges again in a short while. As we see, Petkus was persistent in perpetrating crimes aimed at undermining Soviet power in Lithuania.

On his return to Vilnius, Petkus first led a comparatively quiet life, confining himself to financial machinations in the Society for Folk Arts of the Lithuanian SSR. Petkus's bent for such machinations manifested itself again when he became the sexton of St. Nicholas Church. Petkus misappropriated part of the donations, using the money to buy alcohol for himself and the high-school teenagers whom he persuaded to participate in the church services. In court it was discovered that Petkus regularly got them drunk and corrupted them morally and physically.

When, on August 1, 1975, the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe had been signed, Petkus resumed activity aimed at undermining the Soviet political system under the pretext of "promoting the maintenance of the Helsinki Accords". Petkus was assisted

by several accomplices he had managed to find and form into a group.

Petkus composed pasquils intended to be disseminated abroad and to discredit the political system of Soviet Lithuania and fabricated slanderous "documents" intended for publication and use in the programmes by Radio Liberty.

Thus, Petkus perpetrated actions aimed at undermining Soviet power, discrediting and slandering the Soviet Union.

Such was the conclusion drawn by the Supreme Court of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic which in July 1978 examined the criminal case of Victor Petkus who was charged with a grave crime. When Petkus was tried for the first time, the court displayed maximum leniency. When he was tried for the second time his sentence again was not so severe as the law demanded. However, he continued to perpetrate actions of whose criminal nature he was fully aware. This was a clear case of a repeated commission of crime.

One must be guided by some "special" motives, and interpret both history and current events in a very peculiar way, and have no idea of the current public opinion in the Lithuanian SSR to proclaim Balys Gajauskas and Victor Petkus "prisoners of conscience" as is done by Amnesty International.

This is not a result of misconception or an accidental mistake. In October 1980, the leaders of Amnesty International issued *Amnesty International News Release* calling to launch a campaign to defend Victor Petkus. Amnesty International proposed to declare Petkus "the prisoner of conscience of the month".

What do we read in this connection on page 3 of *Amnesty International News Release*? First of all, we are told that Petkus "has never used or

advocated violence". But did the leaflets which Petkus manufactured and distributed on the orders of the armed murderers and terrorists not contain calls for violence and attempts to justify violence committed in a most direct form, that of murdering innocent people? Secondly, we are informed that Petkus is one of those who had monitored the implementation of the Helsinki Act and were imprisoned or exiled for their advocating human rights, that is, one of those who have been recognised by Amnesty International as "prisoners of conscience".

Amnesty International has misinterpreted self-evident facts so as to portray an opponent of the fundamental ideas of the Helsinki Final Act as their advocate. Amnesty International seeks to picture a person who has all his life been striving to diminish the opportunity for his compatriots to enjoy their rights as a human rights champion and to launch in this connection one of its regular monthly campaigns.

It is not surprising in this context that Amnesty International's stand on this issue fully coincides with that taken by the emigre organisations and publications hostile to the Soviet Union. This stand is also shared by the Supreme Committee for the Liberation of Lithuania founded by the Nazi Abwehr in 1943 to counteract the growing resistance of the Lithuanian people to the German invaders and currently operating under the guidance of certain secret agencies.

Indeed, an analysis of Amnesty International's peculiar interpretation of the past and the present reveals quite a number of paradoxes.

In its 1981 Report Amnesty International makes further efforts to disseminate misinformation. Striking its favourite note it alleges that "the authorities have continued to imprison Helsinki monitors". Amnesty International mentions the

case of "the Helsinki monitor" Vasyl Stus, a member of the "Ukrainian Helsinki monitoring group". Amnesty International's involvement in the Stus case is an example of its unscrupulous profiting by the defence of the persons who, under the guise of supporting the Helsinki principles, commit offences aimed at discrediting the ideas, principles, and goals underlying co-operation and detente in Europe.

The ideas and principles embodied in the Helsinki Final Act prompt the measures designed to establish and foster mutual confidence, and encourage restraint as important factors contributing to the positive development of mutual understanding and co-operation among nations and promoting detente. It is in defiance of these ideas and principles that Vasyl Stus, in his pronouncements and writings (the latter often taking the form of poetry), called for violence and encouraged hostility and mistrust among nations. His poetry provokes base feelings. Stus believes in cultivating vulgar chauvinism and giving priority to narrow local interests. He propagates his ideas on a plea of defending the independence and immunity of the Ukrainian national culture. He pretends to be ignorant of the fact that Ukrainian culture has received a powerful impetus from the fact that the Ukraine has become a part of the USSR and is enjoying the full rights of a constituent republic of the Soviet Union. The implication of Stus's pronouncements in defence of Ukrainian freedom, independence, and originality is the disparagement and slander of the social and political system of the Soviet Union. It should be noted that all these utterances are primitive and vulgar in form.

Vasyl Stus is not a novice at producing defamation and libel. As early as 1963 he drew up a

compact with the former accomplices of the Nazi invaders—a handful of Ukrainian nationalists who betrayed their own Motherland. Stus's writings of the 1970s extol the "deeds" of the bandits, the associates of the pro-fascist political pygmy Bandera, those who burned Ukrainian villages, massacred and executed Ukrainian patriots. Stus lauded the traitors as "national heroes"(!!).

Stus considers himself a national bard, a hero fighting to liberate the Ukraine from "the colonial oppression". In 1979, after having served his term as a prisoner convicted for anti-state activities, Stus wrote a *Memento for the Ukrainian Freedom-Fighter*, a booklet containing instructions for the would-be terrorists, where he calls to "fight for independence" and resort to terror. A fanatic of political extremism, Stus declares: "Revenge is the highest and the most honest of all rewards."

No wonder that the doggerels composed by Stus were reprinted and circulated by the Ukrainian nationalist organisations abroad, first of all in the United States and West Germany. These organisations, known for their hostile attitude to the Soviet Union, come out for recarving Europe and revising the borders in Eastern Europe, opposing, thereby, the decisions of the Helsinki Conference. Stus has been among the favourite authors of such reactionary publishing houses as Suchasnist and Posev. His writings were often published by the *Ukrainian Herald: Underground Magazine*, a publication whose title speaks for itself.

Stus's patrons and defenders are aware of his true identity. Nonetheless, although in 1980 he was convicted for systematically slandering the Soviet Union, discrediting and undermining the Soviet political system, Amnesty International

continues to picture Stus as an innocent "prisoner of conscience" and a "Helsinki monitor".

Unbidden Advocates

Amnesty International is in need of names. Indeed, it could have never managed without them. Could Amnesty International launch a noisy anti-Soviet campaign under the slogan of "defending the victims of repression" without names? Both Amnesty International's bosses and the "researchers" working at its laboratories at 10, Southampton Str. London realise that it would be impossible.

Of course, Amnesty International could risk a double falsehood by inventing both the plot and the names of the heroes. However, the established procedure requires the use of the real name of a real person convicted for a real crime. All the rest can be fictitious. The main thing is to find out the name of a person accused of some wrong-doing. After this has been done, the people from Amnesty's International Secretariat compose a story in which the criminal is portrayed as a "martyr", i.e. a dissenter prosecuted for his beliefs. Then, the local branches are instructed to "adopt" the "prisoner of conscience" and start a campaign involving, among other things, the release of letters, appeals, and memoranda.

Such is the stereotyped pattern of Amnesty International's activity.

Amnesty International's misinformation experts, seeking to sustain a continuous anti-Soviet campaign, portray people convicted for various crimes in the USSR as "prisoners of conscience". At times they happen to pick up those who have already regretted their crime and seek to atone for it by becoming useful and responsible

members of society. In these cases Amnesty International issues appeals, files petitions and circulates letters to "defend" those who do not need to be defended and, what is more important, who have never asked for protection and are angered by the attempts to use their names for unseemly propaganda purposes.

An instance of Amnesty International's uninvited advocacy is the case of Janis Tilgalis who was convicted by the Supreme Court of the Latvian SSR for a number of grave crimes in 1978. Amnesty International, as its leaders were subsequently compelled to recognise, did not know anything about the reasons for prosecuting and convicting Tilgalis. However, as soon as the news of the Tilgalis's trial reached Amnesty International's headquarters, the people there immediately decided to make use of his name. Tilgalis was included in the list of "prisoners of conscience". The Bonn branch of Amnesty International and its spokesman Harold Seebar were especially active in "defending" Tilgalis.

What was Janis Tilgalis's response to his being "adopted" by Amnesty International? This can be best illustrated by his open letter of December 18, 1980.

"Mister Seebar,

"I was staggered to learn, on familiarising myself with certain documents, that the just penalty inflicted on me gave occasion to Amnesty International to advertise me as a 'prisoner of conscience', in other words, a 'victim' of the violation of human rights. You, Mister Seebar, have repeatedly turned to various Soviet organisations urging my release and stressing that I have been 'adopted', as you put it, by a number of Amnesty International groups in the FRG, the United States, Sweden, Switzerland and Belgium. I am convinced that all this has been dic-

tated not by your humane attitude to my humble self, but by a desire to use my name for propaganda purposes....

"While serving my term, I have become aware of the implications of my misdemeanour, errors and delusions which led to a crime. At present I am firmly convinced that I can yet become a useful citizen of my country. I have my parents and my Motherland and I don't want any 'relatives' from Amnesty International as a substitute from them. I have never turned to your organisation for help or support. I beg you to stop bothering me with your concern for my fate."

What happened to Tilgalis was not a unique occasion.

In mid-1979, the 19-year-old student of the Leningrad Medical College Alexei Khavin, then in his first year at the therapeutics faculty, suffered a grave misfortune. He was prosecuted for repeated illegal acquisition of and traffic in drugs and for persuading other people, among them medical students, to misappropriate and use drugs.

It was not that easy for Alexei Khavin to enter the medical college. His first attempt to pass the entrance exams failed. For a year he had worked as a hospital attendant and then took entrance exams again. The results were not too brilliant but he was admitted. Alexei was not particularly keen on his studies. During the second term he threw up his biochemistry, histology, foreign language—all these subjects ceased to be of any interest to him. At the same time, his interest in narcotics picked up. Soon it was clear that Khavin, in the late teens, became a drug-addict.

This case is highly uncharacteristic of the Soviet students. Khavin began with smoking hashish and then passed over to injecting omno-

pon. At first, measures applied to Khavin were of a purely medical nature. But the drug-addict Khavin took up crime. The offences he committed were classified as crimes against public health.

According to the conclusion of the People's Court of the Leningrad Vasileostrovsky District of July 20, 1979 (case No.1-533), between July 1978 and April 1979, Alexei Khavin repeatedly acquired and sold drugs. Moreover, he persuaded other students (among them V. Kudinov and V. Pismenny) to use drugs and was the one to supply them with dangerous narcotics ruining their health and jeopardizing their lives.

He was found guilty of premeditated crime under Section 2 of Article 224, Section 2 of Article 224«2», and Articles 17 and 224«1» of the RSFSR Criminal Code. The Leningrad City Court verified the lawfulness of the sentence by way of cassation and found it unnecessary to change it.

No matter how severe, the verdict was fair and lawful. Indeed, that a medical student should commit offences against public health, instead of training for a doctor's career, was certainly most regrettable.

On learning about Khavin's conviction, Amnesty International's leaders decided to try to profit by his case. Under the plan they elaborated a number of actions were to be taken. First of all, Khavin was to be declared a "prisoner of conscience". Accordingly, Amnesty International's 1980 Report described Khavin as one. Secondly, it was decided to circulate letters protesting against his imprisonment and demanding his release. The purpose was to try and call in question the grounds on which Khavin had been convicted.

Some of the letters were addressed to Professor V.A. Minyaev, Rector of the Leningrad First

Medical College. One of them was typed on a sheet of paper with Amnesty International's letter-head and signed by a certain Waltraud Relke.

Frau Relke expressed her concern about Alexei Khavin having been prosecuted for keeping drugs at his place. In this connection, it should be mentioned that in actual fact Khavin was convicted for intentionally persuading several young people to use drugs in his own mercenary interests. In addition to describing the advantages of taking drugs to Kudinov, Pismenny, Muravyova, Sokolov, Zisserman and Podzorov, he taught them the ways to use hashish and omnopon. He provided these young people with the drugs he had stored for the purposes of traffic.

In her letter Frau Relke declares that there had been no grounds for sentencing Khavin to six years in prison.

The self-styled "experts" from Amnesty International should be reminded that whether there are sufficient grounds for conviction is determined, under Soviet legislation, by the court on the basis of a thorough, all-round and objective examination of the totality of evidence adduced to testify that a "socially dangerous act" has really been perpetrated and that it has been perpetrated by none other but the accused. If this has been established, there are sufficient grounds to find the person guilty of crime and to mete out a punishment prescribed by the legislator for the given category of crimes. The legislator takes into account the nature and the degree of social danger of the crime committed, the personality of the accused, the circumstances in the case palliating or aggravating his offence, the importance of punishment for the effective prevention of a repeated commission of the offence by the person in question and the overall significance of the

prevention of crime. Thus, Amnesty International's pretention to a role of an expert entitled to judge whether a sentence passed by the Soviet court is substantiated or not, is totally groundless.

By the way, Frau Relke must be aware of the great danger of drug-addiction and the importance of taking measures to prevent it as it is of grave concern to the broad circles of the FRG public.

What should be done, in Frau Relke's opinion, about a person who wittingly drags young people into the quagmire of drug-addiction? Indeed, it is most unseemly motives that govern Amnesty International's leaders in their efforts to picture a medical student punished for an intentional poisoning of his college-mates with drugs as a "prisoner of conscience".

Amnesty International's misinformation cliches leap to the eye even more readily in the letter Professor Minyaev received from a certain Christine Jeffrier, a medical student from Nantes, France (3, Rue Moris Duval). Without beating about the bush, Jeffrier declares that Khavin's being in possession of drugs was a pretext for prosecuting him. She says she is surprised at the connection between Khavin's conviction on the charge of possessing drugs and his activity in the cultural sphere and the freedom of expression he exercised.

We vainly searched for the traces of Khavin's activity in the field of culture. All our efforts have been futile.

The letter addressed to the Rector ends in a demand to make inquiries in the fate of one of his students and to inform the author of the letter about the "place and the conditions of his confinement". This is another case of Amnesty International's supplementing misinformation

and provocation with "resolute demands".

What about Khavin's own reaction to Amnesty International's efforts to take care of him and act as his unbidden advocate? We shall reproduce the text of a letter he wrote to his former Rector, when he was serving his term in a corrective labour colony.

"Dear Vladimir Alexeyevich,

"This letter is being written to you by your former student who, as fate willed it, wound up behind bars. The latter circumstance would have certainly prevented me from addressing you, had not certain reasons compelled me to write. As far as I know, you have recently received a letter from France in which a person, whom neither you nor I have ever met, officially requests to make inquiries into the conditions of my confinement and my fate...."

It might be interesting for the reader to know that while doing time Khavin got rid of his thirst for drugs. He works and reads a lot, making sure to get hold of every new book and magazine received by the colony's library. He hopes, on having served his sentence, to enter a medical secondary school and subsequently, with good luck, a medical college. He spoke about this with his former fellow-students who were allowed, in response to a petition from the Rector, to visit Khavin in the colony.

The letter ended as follows:

"I shall always indignantly reject any 'assistance' of my 'unknown' friends abroad who clearly intend to make use of my name and my misfortune for the purposes which I know nothing of but which are obviously malicious. I should like you to tell all those who are interested in the life of the 'heroic martyrs behind the barbed wire of the Kolyma camps' that I am exasperated by their actions.

"I thank you.

"Your former student A. Khavin. "

Soviet newspapers have often published letters or excerpts from letters written by those who were convicted for criminal offences and reacted in a similar way to the provocation fomented by the unbidden advocates from Amnesty International.

Anatoly Novikov, the author of one such letter, wrote that "the law is always the law, and the person who has perpetrated a crime should be duly punished; as for the talk about the "sufferings of freedom-fighters", it is sheer nonsense and bare-faced lie".

The last question that arises in this connection is this: are these letters known to the people in Amnesty International's headquarters and what tactics do they resort to while responding to them?

When the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union made Janis Tilgalis's open letter known to the public, Amnesty International decided to justify itself in a BBC programme.

First of all officials from Amnesty International's headquarters declared that they had not received the letter. Even if this is really so and they haven't received a letter with advice of delivery, they still cannot deny that a letter made public has remained unknown to them.

In the BBC programme of January 8, 1981 an Amnesty International's spokesman made a statement to the effect that there was nothing unusual about the repentance allegedly confessed by Tilgalis because in the USSR political prisoners were often pressurised into publicly repudiating their former views and activities.

Indeed, gentlemen, you either could not or did not want to understand anything. Or, rather, you understood everything very well but continue

to play your misinformation game. In his letter Tilgalis does not repudiate his former views and actions but protests against his name being used by Amnesty International for the purposes of misinformation and political provocation.

Community of Beliefs

On May 21, 1981 Mr. Lambert, president of the French Section of Amnesty International, accompanied by a handful of myrmidons, demonstrated in front of the Soviet Embassy in Paris to protest against "gross violation" of Andrei Sakharov's "human rights".

Measures taken to protect the Soviet social system against actions injuring its prestige and security often provoke a violent reaction in the West.

The ballyhoo leads to a simple and natural event, brought about by society's response to the actions of a person violating the laws of the country, acquiring the dimension of a serious international issue. Its importance is exaggerated and its meaning is distorted in a bid to detract attention from topical issues of real concern to the world's people, as, for example, in the case of Sakharov.

Some of those human rights champions who regularly and wittingly perform actions classified by the criminal law as offences claim impunity. They are prompted by their scornful attitude to the law and public opinion. The psychological complex of solipsism, typical of the elite, and the belief of the chosen ones that they should be permitted to act as they like, underlie their mode of behaviour.

In the case of Andrei Sakharov the morbid vanity and narcissism were combined with his pre-

tentions to immunity. He believed that he was not meant to abide by the law by virtue of his being a chosen one.

Oddly enough, when the Soviet people's patience was exhausted and measures were taken to prevent Sakharov from using certain channels to send materials slandering the Soviet Union to the West (such as the foreign journalists accredited in Moscow and special couriers), the pharisaical chorus of Sakharov's advocates started to sing a refrain in which astonishment was clearly heard: how can the authorities dare to encroach upon the absolute freedom of the one considered to be "untouchable"?!

In January 1980, the authorities showed leniency to Andrei Sakharov: instead of prosecuting him for the actions bordering on a crime against the state, he was required to move from Moscow to Gorky, Russia's major industrial and scientific centre. This decision, based on humanitarian considerations and the recognition of Sakharov's past deserts, was taken in full conformity with the prerogatives of the supreme government body and the legal norms.

One might remember the violent reaction of Sakharov's Western patrons to the above-mentioned measure. One might have also noticed a hint of surprise in many of the comments. The journalist Paul Mathil wrote in a Brussels leading newspaper *Le Soir* that Sakharov had always been considered "invulnerable". *Le Monde* also remarked that Sakharov had always appeared to enjoy personal immunity, to be "untouchable".

Neither Sakharov nor his contractors in the West wanted to take into account the principle of the equality of the Soviet citizens before the law and their duty to observe Soviet laws. This principle underlies the interpretation and application of legislation in the Soviet Union.

Western mass media took pains to build an attractive image of Sakharov, such as could be readily employed for publicity goals. The propaganda machinery in the West composed his image from the elements which either conceal or distort his real character: he is pictured as a champion of peace and human rights, a disinterested and selfless person scorning worldly joys and ready for any sacrifice, who works towards the implementation of the Helsinki Final Act and advocates freedom and veracity of information.

Each feature of this falsified, publicity-oriented portrait conceals diametrically opposite traits. What we are faced with is an amazing bundle of paradoxical contradictions.

Paradox one: over a number of years, Sakharov had been allegedly urging the implementation of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. In actual fact, he has regularly instigated the disruption of the very idea of security and co-operation in Europe. For quite some time he has been counter-acting the Soviet Government's policy of peace, struggle for the relaxation of international tension and arms limitation.

The acceptance of detente is inseparably linked to the recognition of the ten principles governing relations between states as they are laid down in the Final Act. The realistic interpretation of detente entails the recognition of the principle of non-violability of borders and non-interference in internal affairs of other states. However, Sakharov describes such interpretation of detente as "false detente" or "truckling detente".

Sakharov dreams about the elimination of the political system established by the USSR Constitution. His talk about "pluralistic transformation" and elimination of the leading role of the

Communist Party disguises an unambiguous project to undermine the system of political power unanimously supported by the Soviet people.

According to Sakharov, the introduction of capitalism in Russia should be started with urgent "reforms". He urges "partial de-nationalisation of all types of activity with the exception, perhaps, of the heavy industry, the main kinds of transportation and communications..., partial decollectivisation..., restriction of the monopoly of foreign trade...".

Sakharov's ideas often coincide in spirit (and, at times, in letter) with the views propagated by Western broadcasting stations hostile to the USSR. This is not surprising because Sakharov borrowed his ideas from the programmes of Radio Liberty, the Voice of America, and other similar sources, that is, materials fabricated in the anti-Soviet psychological warfare centres. While describing the foreign policy pursued by the Soviet Government Sakharov stresses that the Soviet state "constitutes a danger not only for its own people and its neighbours but for the whole of the world".

As a matter of fact, Sakharov has become a repeater of the basic propaganda principles underlying the majority of the Washington foreign-policy and military-strategic concepts.

Sakharov's pronouncements always contain appeals to interfere in the Soviet Union's domestic affairs.

In point of fact, his call to "bring pressure to bear on the USSR" (see, for instance, his talk with the French Parliamentarian Christian Pierret reproduced in *Le Figaro* of November 28, 1979) constitutes an unconcealed incitement to repudiating the policy of restraint and co-operation.

Moreover, Sakharov urges economic sanctions and military measures against the Soviet Union.

The concept of "the pressure system" has been methodically elaborated by Sakharov over a number of years and now constitutes one of the basic principles of his "philosophy".

As early as 1975, in a brochure pretentiously entitled *My Country and the World* Sakharov wrote: "Only the strongest possible pressure to which the Soviet authorities are vulnerable has prospects of success." He went on to say: "At present the Western countries are not exerting sufficient pressure upon the socialist countries, I am afraid."

In 1978, in his book *Anxiety and Hope* published in the United States Sakharov wrote: "All available leverage should be used: secret and overt diplomacy, the press, demonstrations and other ways of undermining prestige, boycott, the repudiation of co-operation in this or that area, legal restrictions imposed on trade and contacts."

In his appeals addressed to the United States, Sakharov urges military build-up as a means of securing a position of strength from which talks with the Soviet Union should be conducted. These appeals can easily be qualified as high treason, the betrayal of the national interests of one's own country. Moreover, by getting involved in propagating the allegation about the Soviet threat, Sakharov has betrayed the interests of the millions of people throughout the world who struggle to preserve the atmosphere of trust and impartiality as factors ensuring peaceful coexistence and mutual understanding.

Sakharov has aligned with those who wage vigorous struggle against the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union.

According to Sakharov, relations between the West and the USSR should be grounded on the following basic principles: 1) opposition to and

repulsion of the Soviet Union; 2) Western pressure upon the USSR; 3) armed confrontation. Sakharov believes that to counteract the Soviet Union the West should be united. He preaches: "Europe must fight shoulder to shoulder with the trans-Oceanic democracy which is Europe's creation and Europe's main hope." He warns the West against "light-heartedness and near-sightedness" and urges it to show greater concern about securing more reliable deterrence of the Soviet Union. Sakharov shares the United States' displeasure about Western Europe's showing insufficient enthusiasm about Atlantic solidarity, and about unconditionally submitting to the dictat of "the trans-Oceanic democracy".

According to Sakharov, the Third World should also align with the West. He instructs: "The West and the developing countries (should) show the required firmness, unity and consistency.... They should be aware of the common danger."

There can be no doubt that Sakharov conceives Western "opposition" to the Soviet Union in the form of pressure, sanctions and boycott. Sakharov repeatedly called to replace the policy of co-operation based on the recognition of the parties' equality by the policy of applying leverage against the USSR. He specifies: "Economic and political sanctions are extremely important" (see *International Herald Tribune*, June 13, 1980). In the spring of 1980, when the US Administration was making every effort to prevent holding the XXII Olympic Games in Moscow, Sakharov followed suit and urged a "broadest possible boycott" of the Moscow Olympics.

Sakharov goes even further. He proceeds from the necessity of an armed confrontation with the Soviet Union in calling the United States to modernise its armaments with a view to securing for the US a position of force in its relations

with the Soviet Union. Sakharov supports the project to deploy new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe.

Indeed, it is hard to imagine what motives can inspire a person who comes out in favour of increasing the number of missiles targeted at his own country. As a nuclear physicist he is only too well aware that missiles in question are going to be of Pershing-2 type, i.e. equipped with nuclear warheads.

Millions of people oppose the December 1979 NATO decision on deploying new systems of medium-range missiles in Western Europe and altering, thereby, the balance of forces in NATO's favour.

Oddly enough, the protest of the millions of people against the NATO plan to multiply the number of missiles targeted at the Soviet Union is described by Sakharov as a "demagogic campaign". By the way, he is highly sensitive to other people's opinion about him published in the Soviet press. He refers to this as "persecution" and "badgering". As for the positions of the millions of people which run counter to the interests of Sakharov and the NATO generals, they are to be labelled as "demagoguery" and "blackmail".

Sakharov considers the NATO nuclear build-up to be a top priority task. He stresses the importance of this task, when commenting on "plans by the United States and NATO allies for an urgently needed modernization of their missile forces in Europe".

The plans to oppose the USSR foreign policy elaborated by Sakharov provide, along with economic, political and ideological steps, for military measures. In Sakharov's opinion, the Soviet Union is a "closed totalitarian state", and therefore the efforts of the world should

be directed at "general economic, ideological and military opposition to the expansion of totalitarianism".

By declaring that the Soviet Union is allegedly "waging a broad demagogic campaign in Europe aimed at maintaining its military superiority", Sakharov wittingly supports the propaganda ballyhoo intended to substantiate the notorious December 1979 NATO decision to deploy new systems of medium-range missiles in Western Europe and to upset, thereby, the balance of forces in favour of the aggressive NATO bloc.

Paradox two: Sakharov claims the role of the harbinger of progress. One of the works he wrote carries the pretentious title *Reflections on Progress, Peaceful Coexistence, and Intellectual Freedom*.

In actual fact, Sakharov supports the institutions, regimes, and public figures embodying a denial of progress.

There are many cases that vividly testify to the total degradation of this "champion of justice".

On September 11, 1973, three days after the constitutional government under President Salvador Allende had been overthrown and political terror interrupted Chile's progressive development, Pablo Neruda wrote the last pages of his book of reminiscences *I Confess: I Have Lived*. On the last page of this magnificent book written with the blood of his heart Neruda wrote: "Allende's entire activity which has been of invaluable importance for the Chilean nation outraged the enemies of Chile's liberation."

The movement of solidarity with the Chilean people has acquired world-wide dimensions. The world public is stunned by the news of large-scale torture, humiliation of the mothers and

the wives of the patriots, mass reprisals and secret arrests. The scale of the movement of solidarity is accounted for by the fact that the crimes perpetrated by the military-fascist junta challenge the convictions of all honest people, people of good will, who remember the lessons of history and realise the universal danger of fascism.

Fascism may manifest itself in various concrete forms, but its anti-human nature remains invariable. That the slim fingers of the musician Victor Jara had been crushed before he was executed, and that the poet Federico Garcia Lorca was murdered, were acts of anti-humanism and vandalism. Fascism, whatever its manifestations, is a crime against humanity, culture, civilisation. An honest person, no matter where he lives and what he does, cannot and must not keep silent when historical progress is interrupted by the horrors generated by fascism, and human history is marked by such dire tokens as the Buchenwald, the Dowson concentration camp, Oradour, Villa Grimaldi (the Santiago torture chamber), Gestapo and DINA, the Pinochet secret police.

When Sakharov was asked what was his attitude to the developments in Chile he said: "Chile is too far away, therefore I cannot say what is my personal attitude to the issue."

Camus once said that in our age the blind and the naive become partners to crime.

Typically, the "noble champion of peace, human rights and democracy", as Sakharov is referred to by the imperialist propaganda media, in his writings on the theory of politics reveals himself as an apologist of the anti-democratic power system. According to Sakharov, the "ideal society" which is to emerge by the year 2000 will be led by a world government composed of technocrats,

which will determine the fate of the people.

Sakharov's *Reflections on Progress* is full of pompous trivialities pronounced by a person ill-informed about political science. Sakharov idealises the anti-democratic methods of social manipulation. In fact, he discredits the prospects for the development of biological sciences propagating their use for the purposes of "manipulating" the people. According to Sakharov, by the year 2000 "the progress of biological sciences (in the current and the subsequent periods) would have enabled the 'world government' to effectively control and direct all vital processes at the biochemical, cellular, organisational, ecological and social levels, from birth rate and ageing to mental processes, heredity inclusive".

Indeed, one can hardly disagree with the admission Sakharov made in 1975: "I am fully aware of my incompetence in the complex problems of social life."

Unfortunately, this admission was made as a chance remark. Sakharov continues issuing categorical pronouncements on many extremely complicated social problems. They are growing increasingly anti-progressive and anti-democratic. Sakharov substantiates admissibility, expediency and necessity of overthrowing, by any means, including interference from the outside, the social system established by the people. In this Sakharov concurs with the strategists of anti-communism.

Paradox three: Sakharov advocates veracious information and stigmatises misinformation. At the same time, he is the source of large-scale misinformation about the Soviet Union.

In his case, the fabrication of misinformation is deliberate, being aimed at impairing the Soviet Union's prestige and undermining confidence in its domestic and foreign policies.

Sakharov's misinformation is intentionally given a slanderous quality. The misinformation he supplies to the world market is intended to assist the Western press in the efforts to distort the truth about the Soviet Union.

Consider, for instance, Sakharov's participation in organising political provocations against the Soviet Union, in which the most adventurist and extremist political circles were involved. We mean the so-called "Sakharov hearings" held in Copenhagen, Rome and Washington in 1975, 1977 and 1979, respectively.

In the course of the "hearings", a large amount of misinformation, truly astounding in its scale and mendacity, was accumulated.

Sakharov determined the main guidelines for collecting, storing and disseminating slanderous materials. For instance, he set the sponsors of the Copenhagen "hearings" the task of disproving "the information on the economic position of the /Soviet/ citizens, public health, education and housing circulated in the outer world".

Sakharov deliberately encroaches upon the truth about the social and economic achievements of socialist society. Veracious information on everyday life in the USSR, on the social and economic rights of the Soviet citizens which are reliably guaranteed and actually exercised, forms the foundation upon which the Western reader and listener grounds his perception of the life of the Soviet people. It is this foundation that Sakharov seeks to undermine by participating in the "hearings" to which he gave his name.

Sakharov's slanderous attacks are aimed at many key aspects of society's life in the USSR, such as the resolution of the national question and the position of the religious believers. The bulk of misinformation produced by Sakharov

consists of numerous 'distortions about the legal practices in the USSR.

Typically, the materials fabricated by Sakharov or trumped up with his assistance are often reproductions of stories concocted in anti-Soviet propaganda centres. A close analysis of the materials signed by Sakharov shows that they include translations from foreign originals which at times preserve the phrases and abbreviations accepted in English-language anti-Soviet writings but alien to the Russian language.

Sakharov's advocates claim that he is persecuted for his attempts to exercise freedom of information and that this constitutes a violation of the Helsinki Final Act.

We should like to point out that freedom of information has never been and cannot be interpreted as the right to abuse this freedom. The exercise of freedom of information for the sake of regular dissemination of misinformation about the socio-political realities of one's own country is an outrage upon the very idea of freedom and the social purposes of information.

Sakharov, a manufacturer of misinformation, a calumniator and instigator, a champion of anti-detente and aggravation of international tensions, seeks to act under the guise of advocating the principles of the Final Act. His actions display a dangerous intention to trample the spirit and the letter of the Final Act. In his case the abuse of freedom of information is maliciously spearheaded against the interests of his own people.

Sakharov had enjoyed freedom of action for a long time. In fact, he was the main channel of information or, rather, misinformation, which foreign journalists needed to sustain the anti-Soviet campaign waged by the foreign news media hostile to the Soviet Union. An American journalist who represented a leading Washington

newspaper in Moscow was once asked how often he sent materials to his editorial office. Without hesitation, he answered: "This depends solely on Sakharov." The Belgian newspaper *Le Soir* wrote that Sakharov had "unlimited access to the Western press".

All Sakharov's actions were oriented toward the West. He was really something like a broadcasting station whose programmes are designed for a concrete audience.

Members of Sakharov's family have often served as his emissaries. For instance, this role was performed by Elena Bonner, his wife, who was in Rome in 1977, on the pretext of being treated for an eye disease, when "Sakharov hearings" were held there. In 1979, Sakharov's message was conveyed to a similar gathering in New York by his step-daughter Tatyana Yankelevich.

Tatyana and her husband Efrem Yankelevich, acting as Sakharov's "legitimate representatives" abroad, do not shun any base methods so as to foment anti-Soviet hysteria.

Blind hatred for the Soviet Union is known to have united people whose alliance might have looked unnatural at first sight.

On the 28th of November 1977, the Italian newspaper *Il Tempo* published a curious photograph: a grey-haired old man wearing a Metropolitan's hood is bending over a boy of about four. The caption reads: "The Cardinal Joseph Slipy respectfully caresses little Matvey, Andrei Sakharov's grandson."

"Cardinal" Slipy is the former head of the Uniate Church who during the Nazi occupation of the Lvov District gave his blessing to raising an SS battalion *Nachtigall* recruited from among the traitors, Ukrainian nationalists. The battalion participated in the elimination of the inhabitants of the Lvov ghetto. Slipy has taken

shelter in Vatican where he is known for his passionate hatred of the Soviet Union.

That little Matvei is not Sakharov's (as the caption says), but his wife's grandson is really not very important. The boy's surname is Yankelevich. That very Slipy whose hands are stained with the blood of the victims of the Lvov ghetto blessed little Matvei Yankelevich, a Jew by birth. It is only for the sake of cheap publicity that Tatyana Yankelevich, the daughter of Elena Bonner, and Efrem Yankelevich could have wanted the benediction of "Cardinal" Slipy to be bestowed upon their child.

Sakharov has wittingly sought contacts with those who are hatching out plans of a crusade against the Soviet Union. Commenting on this, the Danish newspaper *Information* pointed out that Sakharov permitted various anti-communist and anti-socialist organisations to make use of his name. Sakharov's materials, as well as his portraits, have been willingly published by *El Mercurio*, the mouthpiece of the Chilean military-fascist junta. Sakharov's "contacts" sometimes reached into the areas which have nothing to do with ideology. In such cases, the interests of the Soviet State in ensuring state security and protecting state secrets came to the fore.

There came a time when it was necessary to restrict Sakharov's opportunities to engage in activities injuring the reputation of the Soviet State and the interests of the Soviet people. Despite the fact that there existed overwhelming and indisputable reasons for bringing action against Sakharov and punishing him under the Criminal Code, measures exerted on him were gracious.

Western mass media go out of their way to portray Sakharov's conditions in Gorky as "terrible" and "dreadful". Grey and black colours are used to paint the picture of his life "without rights".

J.-F. Lambert, President of the French section of Amnesty International, declares, for instance, that the mode of life established for Sakharov is tantamount to imprisonment. The more zealous of the hack writers describe Sakharov's conditions as "solitary confinement". Mr. Lambert's associate, Francis Perrin from the French Academy of Sciences, claims that only Sakharov's wife has the right to visit him.

Sakharov lives in a comfortable apartment in Gorky. He enjoys complete freedom in pursuing his scientific interests, that is, he has every opportunity to engage in scientific research in his field of theoretical physics according to the plan and subject he chooses; he enjoys material support due to him as a research worker of the Physical Institute and member of the USSR Academy of Sciences (in the form of money regularly paid out to him, the scientific literature he needs, the opportunity to publish the results of his research in Soviet publications). By the way, since the time he moved to Gorky Sakharov's scientific productivity has risen in comparison with his scientific output in the preceding decade.

It should be noted that the fiction about "the horrors of confinement in Gorky" is bolstered by the provocative utterances regularly made by Sakharov and especially his wife, Elena Bonner. They circulate well thought-out legends about "the disgusting behaviour" of officials designed to compromise Soviet Government bodies. Among them are the stories about Sakharov having been knocked down and beaten by the militiamen in Gorky, about his manuscripts and notebooks being stolen from him, about some officials, pistols in hand, preventing him from saying good-bye to his wife's mother at the railway station. The inquiry established that it was not Sakharov who

was beaten, but a militiaman who was slapped by Elena Bonner. The latter, by the way, recognised her fault and paid a fine for misdemeanour without a murmur.

The hostile propaganda media make use of every tiny fact so as to confuse the issue. In the manuscript of one of the articles he wrote in Gorky ("Mass Formula for Mesons and Barions") Sakharov makes reference to the book by Zeldovich and Novikov *Relativist Astrophysics*. Sakharov remarks in brackets that he does not remember the precise title of the book and that there is no place in Gorky to check it. The article was published in June 1980 in the journal *Experimental and Theoretical Physics*. All the references were naturally checked up. But in May 1980, the article was translated from the manuscript in Stanford University (USA). The author's remark that in Gorky there is nowhere to check up the title of the book he is referring to was used as a pretext to raise a hysterical outcry about Sakharov being denied access to the libraries in Gorky. "Help Sakharov Do Physics", such was the title of an article by David Chudnovsky from Columbia University published in the October 1980 issue of the American journal *Physics Today*. The editors claimed that "there is no library in the city of Gorky that Sakharov has access to". Heinz R. Pagels, President of the New York Academy of Science, referring to Sakharov's remark in the manuscript, alleged: "Doctor Sakharov clearly does not have access to libraries..., he has been denied access to library and research facilities."

In this way another campaign to defend Sakharov was inaugurated. The truth proved to be simple and easy to establish: the book by Ya. B. Zeldovich and I.D. Novikov *Relativist Astrophysics* published in 1967 by Nauka Publishers is

available to any reader in many scientific libraries of Gorky. For instance, it can be borrowed from the Fundamental Library of the Lobachevsky State University. The library has nearly 1,300,000 volumes and subscribes to almost all major scientific journals in physics and mathematics published abroad. The libraries of the Institute of Applied Physics and the Scientific Research Institute of Radiophysics in Gorky also have rich stocks of books. The largest library is the Gorky Region's Lenin Library. Evidently, Sakharov did not bother to apply to any of them. It was much easier to hint at the book being non-available in Gorky in the hope that somebody would seize on it.

The most unfortunate thing is, perhaps, that Sakharov failed to understand the implications of leniency shown to him. He goes on to issue pronouncements which are in harmony with the strategic interests of the opponents of peace, progress and socialism.

Usually, the community of opinions, accompanied by preparedness to take joint actions, is the consequence of loyalty to the common goals. Co-ordinating their actions with common goals brings people together. It is not surprising then that Amnesty International's leaders and Andrei Sakharov have easily understood each other's point of view.

Sakharov calls the West to exercise "ideological resistance" to the Soviet Union. He wants the Soviet Union to be assailed with ideological bombardment. It is small wonder, therefore, that he has a special liking for Amnesty International and pins his best hopes on its ideological assaults upon the USSR. "I have very high regard for Amnesty International," he declares.

Why should they praise each other as inordinately, as if they had joined a mutual admiration

society? It is because both the Amnesty International leaders and Andrei Sakharov have been assigned similar roles in producing misinformation and impairing the prestige of the Soviet Union.

X X X

We have cited a number of examples exposing Amnesty International's reasons for defending or not defending certain people. These examples graphically demonstrate that Amnesty International, an allegedly objective and impartial organisation, is in fact highly tendentious in its activity. This is manifested both in the selection of persons portrayed as "prisoners of conscience" and in the slogans of the noisy campaign it launches; in a word, it is manifested in Amnesty International's overall political orientation.

In 1982 Amnesty International decided to join in the hypocritical chorus of the "defenders" of the Polish people. Through supporting the political propaganda campaign waged by President Reagan's Administration, Amnesty International interferes in the domestic affairs of sovereign Poland. Amnesty International is indignant at the Polish extremists having been interned.

The Polish authorities have repeatedly pointed out that Amnesty International's emissaries (primarily those from the Swedish section) maintained direct contacts and financed the counter-revolutionaries from KOSKOR (the Social Self-Defence Committee). When the legitimate Polish authorities took self-defence measures, in compliance with their plenary powers, Amnesty International decided to proclaim those persons, who had been preparing to overthrow the constitutional regime of the Polish People's Republic, "prisoners of conscience".

SPECIAL SUBJECTS

"Torture with Starvation" and Real Calories

"Prisoners ... resort to eating grass, wild flowers, nettles and the like in order to compensate for the deficiencies of their diet." This is the way Amnesty International describes the treatment of prisoners in the Soviet Union in a bid to move to pity the soft-hearted public.

There is nothing surprising about people using new nettles or wild sorrel for food. In the South of France, in Provence, for instance, people make salad of dandelion leaves. I like nettle and sorrel soup, too. But when Amnesty International supplements the passage cited above with the statement that in the Soviet corrective labour colonies the authorities see to it that all the grass is pulled out so that the hungry prisoners couldn't eat it, this is quite a different matter.

An infusion of birch tree buds is known to be an effective diuretic, almost as good as patent medicines. But when Amnesty International reports that in 1976 the convict Marchenko had to gather and dry birch tree buds to eat them "as a complement to his diet", one realises this is none other than the last stroke which is needed to give a finishing touch to the picture of horrors Amnesty International describes in its 1980 report. This picture is given an impressive caption: "Starving Prisoners".

Amnesty International's leaders decided that the myth about "the torture with starvation"

would be an impressive leit-motiv for their story about the treatment of prisoners in the Soviet Union. Turning over the pages of the above-mentioned Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR, one could not help noticing that the myth about "the torture with starvation" dominates the whole narration of tortures suffered by the prisoners.

"Hunger as a permanent feature of camps and prison life is provided for in the corrective labour legislation." Such is the general thesis of the Report. "Hunger is an essential part of most of the punishments which are regularly imposed on prisoners, but prisoners' regular diet is also such as to cause hunger and malnutrition," Amnesty International goes on to say. The authors of the Report conclude that the conditions and treatment of prisoners in the Soviet Union are repressive because prisoners are regularly deprived of food; this, they go on to say, is the basic characteristic of the regime in Soviet prisons and camps. The above is the variations, as one may notice, of the general, basic thesis.

The manner in which this thesis is elaborated on is typical of Amnesty International's misinformation: a downright lie is wrapped in a pseudo-plausible packing. The general premise is supplemented with an impressive amount of "factual" materials. Amnesty International "analyses" the diet and the standard guaranteed norm of food allotted to the prisoners, counts the calories and compares their number with the standards issued by the World Health Organisation. The authors of the notorious Report want the reader to admire their way of analysing—carefully, skilfully and in much detail—the facts they have allegedly obtained from reliable sources. They want to convince the reader of

hunger and malnutrition being the lot of the prisoner in the Soviet Union.

In order to disprove Amnesty International's allegations one could simply say: "Look at the former Soviet citizens who, after having been released from the corrective labour institutions, left the Soviet Union and are now living in the West under the wing of their guardians and trustees. Do any of them strike one as emaciated and worn out, as persons who have for a long time been suffering from dystrophia?"

Now let us turn to the calorie counts.

The authors of the Amnesty International's Report, referring to the food allowance allotted to the overwhelming majority of prisoners, stress that what they are talking about is a "standard guaranteed norm". They do not elucidate that the guaranteed norm is regularly supplemented with additional rations.

In all the cases when prisoners display a conscientious attitude to their work and fulfil the stint they are set, to say nothing of overfulfilling it, they receive additional calories.

An analysis of the many years of experience shows that the convicts also obtain additional calories from supplementary sources such as the food they buy with their own money in food stores or stalls in the corrective labour institutions, or the food they receive in the form of parcels from their relatives.

All this allows us to conclude that the overwhelming majority of prisoners obtain much more calories than the "standard" norm provides for.

As for the convicts working under severe climatic conditions or engaged in hard work, they are allotted a special norm plus a diet supplement granted for conscientious work.

It should be emphasised that standard rations have been established by the state bodies in

strict compliance with the law and the standards issued by medical institutions and approved by the Ministry of Health. They have been calculated from the point of view of the necessary calorie intake required by the able-bodied person, with due regard for his/her sex, age and the nature and intensity of his/her work.

Amnesty International, seeking to distort the true state of affairs, compares the adulterated "data" on the calorie intake of the prisoners in the Soviet Union to the criteria established by the World Health Organisation. However, having analysed the true facts about the standard norm of food actually received by those convicts who work in the Soviet corrective labour institutions, one cannot help concluding that Amnesty International's allegation about the camp and prison diet falling "far short" of the standards established by the WHO is calculated to substantiate the myth about "torturing the prisoners with starvation".

The food allowance granted to the overwhelming majority of prisoners in the Soviet corrective labour institutions exceeds both the standard norms of the calorie intake established by the medical institutions in the Soviet Union and those issued by the World Health Organisation.

Furthermore, additional rations have been established for special cases.

For instance, the law provides for increasing the calorie intake and introducing certain food-stuffs in the diets of sick prisoners. In particular, there are legally established dietetic rations for the out-patients (these must always include milk and other dairy products, and vegetables), and chronic invalids. For instance, a special diet, which includes health food, is provided to the prisoners suffering from gastric ailments, tuberculosis, etc. A special diet is

also prescribed for the in-patients treated in prison or camp hospitals.

In our opinion, the correlation of sums spent by the prisoners on buying food and on acquiring basic necessities is a convincing proof of the fact that their rations are far from being at a critical level. Over the recent years, the amount of money the convicts spent on food has reduced to the average 36 per cent of all the money they spent.

If the prisoners were permanently suffering from hunger, as Amnesty International alleges, they would spend practically all their money, and not 36 per cent of it, on buying diet supplements. This would be dictated to them by hunger.

It stands to reason that the criteria underlying the prisoners' diets differ from those determining the delicacy and variety of food sold in a delicatessen or served in a restaurant. In any case, the norm of food provided to the prisoners exceeds the calorie intake standards set by national and international experts.

Thus, Amnesty International's story about the prisoners being regularly tortured with hunger is simply an ill-intentioned falsehood fitting into its overall pattern of lies.

Amnesty International's picture of the "ill-treatment" of the convicts confined in the Soviet corrective labour establishments includes, along with the myth about "regular under-nourishment", the legend about the "coercive and often hazardous labour", to use Amnesty's terms.

Although there is actually no need for further comments, we should still note that the Soviet corrective labour policy proceeds, both in terms of legislation and practice, from the conviction that labour, and socially-useful labour at that, forms the basis of reforming and re-educating the persons found guilty of crime and sentenced to

imprisonment. Soviet legislation, in particular the All-Union law, Fundamentals of Corrective Labour Legislation of the USSR and the Union Republics in its Article 27 establishes: "Each convicted person shall have the duty to work. The administration of corrective labour institutions is in duty bound to ensure the enlistment of convicted persons in socially useful labour with due consideration for their work capacity and, if possible, profession."

What is Amnesty International especially worried about? First of all, about the fact that convict labour is obligatory. Amnesty International scans all Soviet publications, suitable for the purpose, looking for passages on the economic significance of convict labour.

It would be ridiculous to deny that convict labour, just as any labour in the Soviet Union, is an economic category. For this reason, any productive economic activity in the corrective labour institutions is aimed at providing the inmates with a possibility to engage in such labour as is of certain economic and social value. The law stresses, however, that "the economic activity of corrective labour institutions must be subordinate to their main task, that of the correction and reform of the convicted person".

As for Amnesty International, it seeks to make out that the convict labour is "punitive in nature".

The point is, however, that the work assigned to the convict is not, in itself, a punishment; the punishment per se consists in the convict being deprived of freedom, i.e. in his having been coerced to change his way of life, in his forfeiting his personal comforts, and in his being forced to observe the regime established in the given corrective labour institution.

The convict is obliged to work by virtue of the general attitude to work, accepted as a social duty of the citizen in the Soviet Union. The role of labour as an instrument of re-education is manifested in the fact that a person convicted for a wrongdoing eventually develops an honest and conscientious attitude to labour.

Unable, naturally, to cite any concrete data characterising the Soviet convict labour system as a negative practice, Amnesty International resorts to general statements and insignificant facts which, although calculated to produce a negative emotional response, cannot prove or disprove anything at all.

Curiously enough, the translations from the English original enhance the emotional effect of Amnesty International's writings. Thus, in the French version of the Report on the Prisoners of Conscience, published in 1980, "convict labour" was turned into "travaux forces" (coercive labour).

Is it really fair to describe convict labour, limited in its duration to a standard 8-hour working day and based on the up-to-date principles of the scientific organisation of labour as "hard" and "coercive"? It would be relevant to mention that in the Soviet Union special research is undertaken to study the possibilities for introducing automation and mechanisation of convict labour and to elaborate and implement projects and recommendations on reducing the most labour-consuming and hard convict work.

Is it really fair to describe convict labour as hard and coercive and taking all their time, if the convicts are granted the opportunity to attend secondary schools (providing a higher level of general education for the convicts) and vocational technical schools? The latter train the convicts in the skills required to cope with the jobs

available in the given corrective labour colony (those of joiners, cabinet-makers, welders, machine-operators, etc.). The convicts are thereby trained in the production skills much in demand in the national economy. It goes without saying that acquiring such skills is important for adjusting oneself to normal life and work after having been released from a punitive institution.

If the people from Amnesty International were capable of self-criticism, it is most probable that, having re-read all they invented about the horrors of the Soviet corrective labour institutions, they would exclaim: "Stop! We have overdone it to the extent that everything we write and say would now appear implausible!"

They have not re-read their tales, however, and they are not suffering from pangs of conscience. They have invented, instead, another "horror story" about the prisoners being forced to wear black underwear.

Could one imagine black underwear? Grey would look more probable. But Amnesty International prefers black. So let it be black.

All this is done, Amnesty International claims, to humiliate and offend the prisoners. It ignores the fact that the Soviet corrective labour system rules out cruelty impairing the human dignity of the prisoners. Soviet legislation prohibits the practices accepted in the punitive institutions in some other countries, for instance, in the United States. Amnesty International passes this over in silence.

Is Amnesty International not acquainted with the factual documents exposing the inhuman ways of treating the prisoners in the United States?

A group of lawyers from various countries, who visited the United States in August 1979 in connection with the complaint filed with the UN Commission on Human Rights, studied the condi-

tions of prisoners' life and work in the four southern states (Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi). They made a conclusion to the effect that the coercive labour in the prisons they had inspected was tantamount to slavery and that this, in fact, was a violation of section I of the 13th amendment of the US Constitution, that is, a violation of the declaration abolishing slavery.

The lawyers devoted special attention to the Management Control Programme elaborated by the Federal Bureau of Prisons at the US Ministry of Justice and enacted in 1972.

The Programme provided for the confinement of prisoners in special cells. A model unit of "management control cells" was built on the territory of the Marion Prison, a federal penitentiary in the state of Illinois, which replaced the notorious Alcatraz Prison on a rocky island in the San-Francisco Bay. The conditions of confinement in the cells of the Marion Prison were examined by the Federal Court in 1978 (the Bono vs Saxbe case). The complaint filed by a group of lawyers stated that the "management control cells" constitute a "modern version of medieval torture-chambers".

Despite the contradictory nature of the decision handed down by Judge Foreman, it was recognised that "the management control cells" were used to "silence religious leaders and dissidents in the areas of economics and philosophy".

Nonetheless, the judge refused to prohibit the further use of the "management control unit", referring to the programme launched by the US Ministry of Justice and to the "preventive confinement doctrine".

Numerous documents and other evidence testified to the wide use of tear-gas and psychotropic gases for the purposes of controlling the behav-

iour of inmates. The use of these gases as a method of "disciplining inmates" in the US prisons was attested by the International Commission of Jurists (whose Secretariat is located in Geneva).

The report by the New York correction board mentions several cases of prisoners dying from an overdose of gas. The UN Commission on Human Rights received the materials of closed hearings in the sub-committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives of US Congress on cases of operations on the brain the prisoners were subjected to without their consent. The operations were carried out under the Management Control Programme.

The use of psychotropic medicines (without any medical supervision) for the purposes of "management control" was also reported.

Moreover, the materials mentioned above contain information on using the prisoners for the purposes of medical tests conducted under contracts with pharmaceutical firms. The inmates were inoculated with various infectious diseases so as to test the effect of newly-developed curative preparations. According to one of the experimenters, whose statement was leaked to the press, "the inmates are a wonderful experimental material, and they cost much less than the chimpanzee".

The conditions obtaining in the prisons of many other countries are no less appalling. Suffice it to mention the notorious Nafha Prison in Israel. In 1980, the Nafha Prison, built in a desert, was added to the 16 prisons of the country. It was intended specially for the Palestinian patriots convicted by the Israeli judges on false charges and trumped-up evidence. The inhuman regime in the Nafha Prison is expected to break the prisoners' will to resist the Israeli in-

vaders. Prisoners, who wear handcuffs and fetters, are regularly beaten and threatened with death. The iron-clad doors of overcrowded cells are hot with the heat of the desert, the tiny windows can hardly let in any fresh air, the inmates eat and sleep on the floor.

Does Amnesty International know about all this? We think it does. It simply cannot be ignorant of the universally known facts.

In this connection one may suspect that the myths about the "black underwear" and "the torture with starvation" are invented and spread so as to divert attention from what is happening elsewhere.

"Hunger Strikes"

On May 22, 1981 the American newspaper *International Herald Tribune*, published in Paris, reprinted an article from *The Los Angeles Times* under a mysterious headline "The Quiet Hunger Strikers". The article was written after the world public had been shaken by the news of the death of Bobby Sands and his comrades who gave their lives in the struggle against political reprisals and terror unleashed by the British authorities in Northern Ireland. However, it was not their fate that disturbed Murray Seeger, the author of the article. Murray Seeger confined himself to reproducing, in a clumsy and crude fashion, the version about the Irish patriots-republicans, who died as a result of a hunger strike in prison, having been "gunmen of the Provisional Irish Republican Army". The implication was that Bobby Sands and his comrades had been rightfully convicted for violent actions including the use of arms and that they could not by any means have been granted the status of

political prisoners. That is all Seeger has to say about Bobby Sands. In his view, it is the martyrs elsewhere that should provoke the public's concern. Take, for instance, he suggests, the "quiet" hunger strikers in the Soviet Union. The author explains that they are referred to as "quiet" because their fate is passed over in silence. And this should not be so. This is what the author is driving at in sharing with the reader the "sensation" about the conditions in Soviet prisons.

"The hunger strike is the traditional weapon of prisoners in the Soviet Union," alleges *The Los Angeles Times*.

We couldn't help being amazed by the author's choice of the epithet "traditional". Why "traditional"? Our acquaintance with similar materials and similar word usage enabled us to conclude that what we are faced with in the case of Murray Seeger's article is a "traditional" phenomenon indeed, in other words, the traditional way of fabricating misinformation. It was not hard to establish that the material to support the misinformation about "hunger strikes" in Soviet prisons had been supplied by Amnesty International.

Indeed, the new edition of the notorious Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR sets forth a premise repeatedly reproduced elsewhere: "In spite of their constant undernourishment prisoners of conscience frequently resort to hunger strikes as a means of protest."

A typical example of gambling on the theme of "hunger strikes" in Soviet prisons is Amnesty International's early 1981 campaign to save the life of a certain Mikola Rudenko, who had allegedly gone on a hunger strike while in prison.

Mikola Rudenko was convicted in 1977 for the ill-intentioned, systematic fabrication and dis-

semination of materials slandering the Soviet state and the Soviet social system. As was proved in court, in circulating the materials he trumped up, Rudenko wittingly aimed at causing damage to the Soviet state. The materials he handed over to foreign secret services were used to undermine the prestige of the Soviet Union, a co-signatory of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Mikola Rudenko is now serving his term in a corrective labour colony in Mor-dovia.

In early 1981 the French section of Amnesty International (in particular its Caen group, whose office is situated in the industrial and university town of Caen, Calvados) circulated an *Urgent Appeal*, which read: "We are issuing an urgent appeal. The life of Mikola Rudenko is endangered. On the 19th December 1980, the sixty-year-old prisoner, suffering from deplorable physical conditions, announced a hunger strike.... We call on you to take urgent action."

On Amnesty International's instigation letters and telegrams were circulated throughout the world and complaints were lodged with various international organisations. Referring to the "reliable" information received from Amnesty International, their authors alleged that Mikola Rudenko's life was jeopardized.

According to Amnesty International's legend, Rudenko went on a hunger strike on December 19, 1980. On February 23, 1981, an authoritative inter-government organisation received a petition calling for urgent measures to save Rudenko's life. Indeed, a two-month-long hunger strike might have turned to be fatal. Another month passed. The noisy campaign continued to unfold.

What did really happen? It turned out that by that time Rudenko had been in hospital for sev-

eral months. As a vice-president of the Association of Soviet Lawyers I made inquiries about his health. The administration of a major hospital for prisoners sent me an official reply. Since the reply disproves Amnesty International's invention in a most straightforward and convincing manner, I decided to reproduce it here:

"Since December 21, 1980 Mikola Rudenko has been in the surgical ward of the central hospital suffering from an acute urine arrest caused by a third-degree prostate gland adenoma.

"On December 23, 1980 Rudenko underwent the first stage of the operation for the adenoma during which an artificial fistula of the bladder was applied.

"On March 23, 1981 he was submitted to the second stage of the operation: ablation of the adenoma of the prostate gland. The operation was performed by an expert urologist from the republican hospital of the Mordovian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic.

"The recuperation is taking its normal course, without any complications. The patient is feeling well." On June 5, 1981, upon the completion of the treatment, Rudenko was discharged from the hospital.

Thus, while Amnesty International was sounding the alarm and campaigning to save the life of Mikola Rudenko who had allegedly gone on a hunger strike, he was imperturbably undergoing competent treatment administered to him on his request and with his consent.

Amnesty International makes every effort to convince the public that "prisoners of conscience" are allegedly subjected to all sorts of oppression and "punishment" while serving their term in prison.

Moreover, Amnesty International claims that

Soviet authorities trump up "further charges" in order to prolong the dissidents' detention. The 1981 Report alleges: "Further charges were brought against several prisoners of conscience before the end of their sentences leading to their continued detention." By way of an example they cite the case of Alexander Bolonkin.

Curiously enough, Andrei Sakharov, following in the wake of Amnesty International, mentioned A. Bolonkin in the materials he circulated abroad in a bid to mobilise support for the Soviet "prisoners of conscience". He wrote that A. Bolonkin, a "prisoner of conscience", was "again convicted on false charges". In this case, too, Sakharov repeated somebody else's allegations, reproducing not only the content but also the words and expressions of the original.

However, both Sakharov and the well-wishers from Amnesty International have once more made fools of themselves.

This is how things happened in reality. In early 1982, Alexander Bolonkin was tried on a charge of fabricating and disseminating slanderous materials intended to undermine the prestige of the Soviet Union. The trial was held in the town of Ulan-Ude. The court made a careful examination of the testimony, heard the witnesses, and scrutinised material evidence. The charges were fully substantiated. Alexander Bolonkin pleaded guilty and repented of his offences. During the trial, Bolonkin had an opportunity to make a statement to the press and to appear on television.

In his detailed statement Bolonkin tried to explain what made him take to crime and what later made him repent and condemn his own past activities as detrimental to the interests of his country.

Bolonkin spoke about his unhappy childhood,

about the difficulties his mother, a cleaner, experienced bringing him up in the years of the war and of the post-war reconstruction period. The most important landmarks in his career were his studies in an aviation secondary technical school and the Kazan aviation institute, his work in a design office, and his correspondence course at the faculty of mechanics and mathematics of the Kiev University. During the eight years after his graduation from the University, he was teaching at various higher educational establishments, including the well-known Bauman Higher Technical School in Moscow.

Describing his career (at that time he was in his late thirties), Bolonkin wrote: "There came a time when I started to think that my contribution to science was not duly appreciated. I believed that I deserved greater recognition and that in the Soviet Union my abilities would never be appreciated at their true value. I met a group of people who were hostile to our country and who, taking advantage of my vanity and egoism, involved me in their anti-Soviet activities. They provided me with anti-Soviet literature in which our achievements were passed over in silence while the shortcomings were exaggerated, the history of the Soviet state was distorted and allegations were made to the effect that in the USSR human rights were violated."

Bolonkin recounts his joining Balakirev, Shaklein and Yukhnovets in trumping up and disseminating materials slandering the Soviet Union.

In 1973 he was convicted. In those days he did not realise that he deserved his severe punishment. He continued to make pronouncements denigrating the Soviet social and political system. He wrote a number of statements and appeals in which he slandered and distorted Soviet realities

and the policy pursued by the Soviet government. Some of the materials concocted by Bolonkin were circulated in the West with the object of discrediting the Soviet Union. All this accounts for the fact that in 1981 Bolonkin was tried and convicted again.

"During the trial I realised all the gravity of the crime I had committed. Convincing facts were adduced in order to disprove my erroneous perception of Soviet realities," wrote Bolonkin. "All this set me thinking about my life and led me to the conclusion that I had been deluded and that my activities had done great harm to my country." Having recognised his mistakes and repented of the offences he had perpetrated, Bolonkin exposed his former confederates, the people whom Amnesty International and Sakharov place as "prisoners of conscience".

Bolonkin wrote that the so-called dissidents picture the drawbacks they observe in the life of the country as "permanent negative phenomena; they do not realise, or, rather, do not want to realise that only a socialist society guarantees freedom, equality and fraternity, and that in our country unemployment has been eliminated, health service is free of charge, people are granted pensions and various benefits and allowances, and the rent is very low."

He concludes bitterly: "I understood that the dissidents are a small group of miserable people who are capable of nothing else but maliciously slandering their own country."

It is noteworthy that, speaking about dissenters, Bolonkin acknowledges: "Among them there are people who are beneath criticism both politically and morally, who turned their dissident activities into a means of subsistence or a source of income."

In his statement Bolonkin mentions the names

of those whom Amnesty International has repeatedly described as people persecuted for their convictions and their struggle for freedom and justice. Bolonkin says that he knows some of them personally and that he would describe them as ones "who strive only after their personal well-being, who are money-grubbers, who think nothing about robbing their fellow-men, who are morally degraded".

This is the way another soap bubble blown by Amnesty International exploded.

"Punitive Medicine": a Big Lie

In the early years of Soviet power, when the Western press used to portray the Bolsheviks as Cyclops with daggers between their teeth, the bourgeois philistine was intimidated by widely circulated propaganda clichés designed to discredit the Soviet social system. Among them was the "big blanket" myth, that is, the allegation that the October Revolution effected the "collectivisation of wives", replacing traditional conjugal ties by the common use of wives.

Fifty or sixty years later such absurd and improbable lies became a comparatively rare occurrence.

Nonetheless, the Western propaganda machine has not completely abandoned its method of issuing wholesale lies. In psychological warfare centres this method is given ever greater priority. Suffice it to mention the widely circulated myth about the abuse of medicine, in particular psychiatry, for the purposes of political reprisal.

The lie about the "punitive function of psychiatry in the USSR" was pioneered by Amnesty International; it has placed on an industrial

basis the manufacture and distribution of materials which, through biased generalisation and garbling, carry on the myth on the use of psychiatry for the purposes of political persecution.

The starting point of the whole story about the abuse of medicine for the purposes of political repression is the allegation that psychiatry in the Soviet Union is politically oriented and used, on a large scale, as an instrument of coercion for political purposes.

Amnesty International has evolved different versions of "the abuse of psychiatry for political purposes". The formula recurring more often than all the rest reads as follows: "The fact that the authorities have systematically confined non-violent individuals to psychiatric hospitals against their will is itself clear evidence that psychiatry has been abused for political purposes." Thus, two different arguments are used to to substantiate the above allegation. First, it is alleged that people are confined to psychiatric hospitals "against their will". One could comment that insane persons are rarely confined to psychiatric hospitals of their own free will; indeed, a mental patient confined to a psychiatric hospital at his wish is a highly improbable case. Thus, the first of Amnesty International's arguments does not and cannot substantiate the thesis about the "political orientation" of psychiatry in the Soviet Union. Secondly, Amnesty International speaks about confining "non-violent individuals" to psychiatric hospitals. To this one could say that violence, aggressiveness or unruly conduct are not characteristic of all forms of mental diseases, as medical practice and science can easily corroborate. A mental illness can well be the reason behind a socially dangerous action without involving, however, violence and aggres-

siveness. This refutes Amnesty International's second argument.

Let us consider the case of instigation to actions aimed at overthrowing a state system. Can such actions be perpetrated by an insane person? Alas, yes. And what about the cases when slandering the nationalities policy formulated by the Soviet state is combined with the actions meant to incite nationalist sentiments and national antagonisms?

Such actions may not always involve violence. Nonetheless, an insane person may be dangerous for the community and therefore should be isolated and submitted to compulsory treatment.

Legal practice bears out that insane persons account for nearly 10 per cent of offences mentioned above.

It is not by accident that I have referred to legal practice. According to Soviet law, the decision on applying coercive medical measures to an insane person can be taken only by the court. The law provides for the use of a whole range of legal guarantees and procedures, including the participation of a counsel for the defence, in considering such cases.

It is surprising that Amnesty International assails these legal procedures. It is especially amazing as the people from Amnesty International's London headquarters must certainly be familiar with the procedure of dealing with similar problems accepted in Great Britain under the Mental Health Act of 1959.

The Act grants the right of taking decisions as regards the treatment of insane persons to the administrative body, to be more exact, to the Secretary of State for the Home Department who may, on his own authority, at his own discretion and without disclosing his motives, confine people to psychiatric hospitals.

The authors of the Report on the Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR must certainly know that in the Soviet Union legal proceedings and decisions on taking compulsory medical measures are preceded by the examination of the case by a commission of experts in forensic psychiatry. The Amnesty International people do not deny their being aware of this fact. Nonetheless, they take the liberty to claim that there are political reasons behind the diagnoses established by expert psychiatrists. Why? On what grounds are such conclusions made? On the grounds that Soviet psychiatrists in certain cases prefer "observations" (the observations made while interviewing the patient and recording his reaction) to "testing". Amnesty International describes the first method as subjective and the second, as objective. Since the Soviet psychiatrists give preference to the first method, the Soviet approach to diagnosing mental diseases is regarded as "the inadequate examination of the subject".

Thus, Amnesty International makes bold to give its own assessment to psychiatric diagnostics evolved by Soviet medical science. Misinterpreting Soviet methods of diagnosing mental diseases, Amnesty International pictures Soviet psychiatric diagnostics as "abuse of psychiatry for political purposes".

By resorting to an oversimplified and biased interpretation of scientific concepts elaborated by the authoritative representatives of the pre-revolutionary Russian and Soviet schools of psychiatry, Amnesty International, in effect, encourages the incompetent reader's own judgement on the scientific worth of the theoretical principles underlying Soviet psychiatric practices.

The ill-informed reader, incompetent in medi-

cine, will hardly take the liberty to judge the scientific quality of research in cardiology, gastroenterology or surgery. However, Amnesty International's officials for some reason think it possible to submit for the consideration of the incompetent reader scientific conceptions expounded, for instance, by Professor Snezhnevsky, a member of the Academy of Medical Sciences of the USSR, a psychiatrist who has a world reputation and is the founder of his own school in psychiatry.

By accusing Professor Snezhnevsky of having offered a description of latent schizophrenia (which is not always accompanied by external symptoms) suitable for diagnosing people pinpointed for political repression as schizophrenics, Amnesty International makes bold to portray Soviet psychiatrists as professionally incompetent people. Through juggling and garbling the facts, Amnesty International seeks to insinuate that the expert Soviet psychiatrists who are responsible for confining insane persons to psychiatric hospitals are ignoramuses and charlatans. Amnesty International reports about a Soviet psychiatrist who, when asked what symptoms enabled him to diagnose a mental illness in a patient, allegedly answered: "The absence of symptoms of an illness cannot prove the absence of the illness itself." It is obvious that by citing such statements the authors of Amnesty International's Report either hope to make Soviet doctors appear frauds or expect the reader (who has by this point become confused and upset by what he has already read) to swallow any sort of fiction he is offered.

What a Soviet doctor might have meant by making a statement of the kind mentioned above, is quite a different thing. An insane person capable of committing a crime against the community

may not necessarily impress the people surrounding him as being mentally ill. In other words, the symptoms of his illness may not manifest themselves clearly enough for an incompetent person to conclude that he is suffering from a mental derangement. Some symptoms of mental illnesses can be recognised only by an expert psychiatrist. This is also the case with the latent form of schizophrenia.

At the same time, it is well known that actions resulting from a malicious intent of a sane person and those caused by a psychopathological condition of a sick person may seem to be similar when judged by their outward (objective) appearance. This accounts for the fact that while a sane person convicted of a crime must be punished under a criminal code, an insane person cannot be made answerable for his socially dangerous actions and should be subjected to coercive medical measures.

Amnesty International tries to make things out in such a way as though in the Soviet Union any form of behaviour "contrary to the accepted way of life" provides sufficient grounds for recognising a person mentally ill.

Indeed, the line of distinction between the truth and falsification in such allegations is really hard to notice. It is only natural that in diagnosing a mental illness a psychiatrist proceeds both from objective symptoms and the criteria which are rooted in the system of social and cultural values and, consequently, the way of life "accepted" in the given society. For this reason, similar behaviour may be assessed differently in different socio-cultural conditions. Consider, for instance, the case of cannibalism. What we perceive as an anomaly is known to be regarded as normal in other cultural contexts, where the traditions prevailing

in the community are different from ours.

Amnesty International's description of the conditions and treatment in the Soviet psychiatric hospitals constitutes another, and still more malicious, part of the legend about "punitive medicine".

Amnesty International tries to convince the public that the treatment administered in Soviet psychiatric hospitals is, in fact, a special system of punishment affecting the psychics and causing incredible physical suffering.

Those who trump up Amnesty International's "documents" operate with the names of "appalling preparations", in the hope to frighten ill-informed readers. They try to stun the reader by mentioning haloperidol, aminazin, and triftazin. Originally they gave to understand that these drugs were invented and administered by Soviet doctors to punish the dissidents. Later, however, Amnesty International was compelled to admit, albeit in passing, that these medicines were used under different names "in many other countries". For instance, in the United States haloperidol is known as haldol and the different modifications of aminazin are known as torazin, chloraktyl, chloriromazid, etc.

Amazing allegations are made that "these drugs are ... applied as a means of punishing inmates". This is not a slip of the tongue but, rather, a slander which is wittingly circulated. One becomes convinced of this when he comes across a variation on the same theme: "In a number of known cases dissenters have been treated with these drugs ... without even been diagnosed by psychiatrists." What he reads further on is even more amazing: "In known cases aminazin, haloperidol, triftazin and similar drugs have been applied at the request of, or even by decision of, entirely untrained orderlies."

Just think: the drastic drugs which are produced, administered and even stored according to special, very strict rules, are applied without the patients being first examined by psychiatrists (!) or "by decision of orderlies" (!).

Thus, Amnesty International seeks to picture the treatment administered in the Soviet psychiatric hospitals as political reprisals against the "dissenters", and Soviet psychiatric hospitals, as torture-chambers.

What "sources" does Amnesty International operate with in trying to substantiate its story about the treatment of the dissenters announced to be mentally ill?

Amnesty International resorts to its favourite method of imparting plausibility to fiction. It refers to three main "sources of information". First comes the pasquil written by Alexander Podrabinek in 1977 and entitled "Punitive Medicine". The material was trumped up on the orders from Amnesty International in accordance with the "conclusions" it had formulated beforehand. Before being used as the main "factual material" for the 1980 Report, the story had been widely circulated throughout the world.

In its 1978 report Amnesty International mentioned that during the year under review it had prepared (?!) and disseminated throughout the world (!) a series of documents on psychiatric abuses in the USSR. The most valuable among them, it stressed, was Alexander Podrabinek's "Punitive Medicine".

The resolution adopted by the Sixth Congress of the World Psychiatric Association, held in Honolulu (Hawaii) in August 1977 also figures among the evidence adduced by Amnesty International. This totally unsubstantiated resolution is a case of involving an international

science organisation into psychological warfare. The resolution, which does not provide any proofs, is in fact a non-scientific, politically biased document adopted as a result of manipulating with votes on the basis of unrepresentative poll.

Lastly, Amnesty International quotes from the statements made by the former patients of Soviet psychiatric hospitals now living in the West.

Dealing with this category of "evidence", Amnesty International takes the liberty of claiming that those who provided it had been confined to psychiatric hospitals without medical reasons. For instance, Amnesty International declares: "Many prisoners of conscience (i.e. those who prior to emigrating had been treated in Soviet psychiatric hospitals) have been met by foreign psychiatrists and other individuals"(?) who have come to the conclusion that there were no authentic medical reasons for their having been confined to psychiatric hospitals.

In this connection we should like to remark that a psychiatrist is not always able to diagnose a mental illness in the case when he is dealing with a former mental patient during his temporary remission.

Furthermore, Western mass media pass over in silence those known cases when former mental patients, who had left the Soviet Union and were taken under the wing of certain circles in the West, found themselves in psychiatric hospitals again.

The judgments and conclusions made by foreign experts are sometimes really amazing, to put it mildly. For instance, the French psychiatrist Professor Ferdiere, who examined Leonid Plyushch, "a mathematician of genius", on his arrival to Paris in early 1976, made a striking conclusion: "All his family consists of geniuses!"

Note that Professor Ferdiere could not have drawn this conclusion from talking to the Plyushches because there existed a language barrier that separated them. How could he, then, diagnose the "genius" of Leonid Plyushch and his sons, the ten-year-old Lesik and the 16-year-old Dima? This is, obviously, a professional secret of both Professor Ferdiere and the *Paris-Match* correspondents who reported the case. By the way, the 16-year-old Dima, who was abducted from the USSR by his parents against his will, is known to have shrunk into himself and refused to talk to anyone at all when he was brought to France.

I am not a psychiatrist. But I saw Victor Fainberg, Amnesty International's ward, in Copenhagen, at the meeting between the representatives of the Danish public and the Soviet cultural delegation. Running about the hall, Fainberg shrieked: "You are murderers!" The psychiatrist, who accompanied him, had a hard time calming and taking him away.

While in France, I saw a televised interview with Pyotr Grigorenko. I could not help being moved and, at the same time, amused at the sight of Grigorenko's interviewers who seriously listened to his tales about his having relinquished the substantial prospects for becoming a Marshal of the Soviet Union and opting for the laurels of a human rights champion.

I saw Leonid Plyushch in Paris, too. It was a sorry spectacle: a pitiful creature incoherently uttering anti-Soviet incantations to the accompaniment of a buoyant and fluent French "translation".

I am not, certainly, attempting to make an expert conclusion about the psychic condition of the above-mentioned persons. I am only describ-

ing the impressions and conclusions which could have been formed by any unbiased person.

On February 19, 1981 Amnesty International circulated a memorandum "Urgent Action 38/81" calling for an urgent campaign to release, immediately and unconditionally, "the prisoner of conscience" Anatoly Koryagin.

The French magazine *L'Express* once commented (see its issue of October 23, 1981) that an order issued by Amnesty's International Secretariat set in motion the organisation's mechanism involving the actions of thousands upon thousands of its members in various countries, "ready to write letters, organise demonstrations or sign petitions on receiving a telex from the 'centre'".

This time, too, the order from the headquarters triggered an expected reaction. The most curious thing about it was its speed. During the inquest, Anatoly Koryagin was taken into custody. This happened on February 13. On February 19, when the investigation was still at its initial stage, Amnesty International already urged "immediate and unconditional release" of the psychiatrist Anatoly Koryagin. Amnesty International did not hesitate to refer to Dr.Koryagin as a "prisoner of conscience".

Amnesty International's Memorandum 38/81 of February 19 stressed that "medical professionals" were "particularly requested to appeal on behalf of Dr.Koryagin ... and try to bring Dr. Koryagin's case to the attention of medical and psychiatric associations". Indeed, various medical associations received letters, appeals, and memoranda. Before us is a copy of one such "memorandum" dated February 27, 1981. It is addressed by Teresa Bernardez, Professor of Psychiatry from Michigan State University, to the American Medical Association and American

Medical Women's Association. At the time of writing Teresa Bernardez could not, naturally, know anything about Dr. Koryagin or dispose of any veracious information on his "case". Nonetheless, in her memorandum she took the liberty of referring to Anatoly Koryagin as "a prisoner of conscience" and a "prosecuted colleague". The addressees are, naturally, unaware of the fact that the authors of such memoranda act on the orders received from the "centre".

The court, which was yet to try Anatoly Koryagin, had neither formed an opinion on his personality nor acquainted itself with the charges brought against him when Amnesty International claimed that it knew all the circumstances in his case and everything related to him personally. How can one account for this? Can it be that the people from Amnesty's headquarters knew all the details about the actions Koryagin had to take well before he actually took them?

In its Memorandum of February 19, 1981 Amnesty International claimed that Koryagin had examined a certain Alexei Nikitin, an engineer, established that he was mentally sound and declared that there were no medical grounds for his confinement to a psychiatric hospital. Amnesty International claimed that it had at its disposal a conclusion Koryagin had drawn upon examining Alexei Nikitin. As to Nikitin himself, Amnesty International alleged that he was persecuted for "protesting about workers' conditions to Western newspaper correspondents".

Nikitin also figures in Koryagin's slanderous article entitled "Unwilling Patients", which was also published by *Posev*, a journal of the so-called Popular Labour Union, an organisation known for its hostile attitude to the Soviet Union. This organisation, located in Munich, is

functioning under the wing of various special services and is composed of emigres and a handful of former Nazi accomplices. Shortly after the article was published in *Posev* it was reprinted by *Les Cahiers du Samizdat*, a libellous magazine printed in Brussels, and by the British medical journal *The Lancet*. The article begins with the statement that its author seeks "to analyse the conditions under which mentally sound persons have been declared mentally ill and condemned to exist as such in the Soviet Union".

In his attempts to substantiate the allegations about the forcible confinement to psychiatric hospitals of "unsuitable" citizens Koryagin repeatedly cites the case of Anatoly Nikitin.

Koryagin claims that Nikitin's "psychiatric Odyssey" was consequent on his coming out in defence of coal-miners' rights. Referring to the information allegedly obtained from A. Nikitin, he reports "that when in 1971 and 1977 Nikitin was submitted to forcible treatment without being examined by a commission of psychiatrists, he declared a hunger strike". Koryagin claims that while in "psychiatric prison" Nikitin was administered neuroleptics "exclusively as punishment".

In order to expose, in an objective and comprehensive way, A. Koryagin's way of garbling medical facts and circumstances related to Nikitin's case, in particular those connected with his illness, we shall examine authentic case records and compare them with the allegations of the pseudo-expert Koryagin. Here we are compelled to make a reservation. The Soviet medical professionals, medical associations and institutions have repeatedly declared that they resolutely oppose making public the names of patients. Pro-

fessional medical secrets are never disclosed. This is provided for by the law. According to the Fundamentals of Health Legislation, "doctors and other medical workers must not make public the information on the illnesses and the personal and family life of citizens which they may come in possession of in the course of discharging their professional duties" (Article 16). However, the names of certain persons have been repeatedly mentioned in the materials issued by Amnesty International and the Western press; therefore we are not going to be the first to refer to them. Moreover, since these names have been adduced in counterfeit materials, we deem it not only admissible but also necessary to make efforts to restore the truth, referring in this to concrete names and authentic case records.

Let us consider Nikitin's allegation that in 1971 and 1977 he was forcibly confined to a psychiatric hospital without having been examined by a commission of experts in forensic psychiatry.

As a psychiatrist working in the Kharkov Region Psycho-Neurological Clinic Koryagin could not be ignorant of the fact that a patient might be submitted to coercive treatment only after an appropriate conclusion had been made by a commission of forensic psychiatry experts and a decision to this effect had been taken by a court. When in December 1971 Nikitin was brought to court and the investigator, upon talking to him, concluded that he might be mentally deranged, he was confined to Psychiatric Hospital No.1 in Odessa so that he could be carefully examined by forensic psychiatry experts as an in-patient. On March 23, 1972 the commission issued a conclusion (Act No. 101) diagnosing Nikitin as an irresponsible person suffering from paranoia.

In May 1976 when Nikitin's condition had im-

proved, he was discharged from the Donetsk Region Psychiatric Hospital. Shortly after that, however, Nikitin's behaviour revealed symptoms of the delirium of persecution and personality affection. He stole a pistol with a live cartridge, took a train to Moscow and forced his way to the Norwegian Embassy.

On March 24, 1977 a Commission of Experts of the 1st Moscow Psychiatric Hospital diagnosed Nikitin's illness as "delirious development of psychopathic personality. This corroborates that in 1971 (or, rather, in 1972) and in 1977 the forensic medical conclusions were also made by competent psychiatrists.

Let us now consider Koryagin's allegation that neuroleptics were administered to Nikitin "exclusively as punishment". In the conclusion Koryagin drew on September 6, 1980 after having allegedly examined Alexei Nikitin, he claims that as a patient of the Dniepropetrovsk hospital Nikitin was administered neuleptyl and chloprolixen, and injected glucose with neuroleptics by way of punishment.

In point of fact, the administration of triaf-tazin and neuleptyl led to the fact that in 1978 Nikitin displayed less vivid symptoms of affective persecutory delusion.

Koryagin also distorted Nikitin's life story, especially those circumstances which could have really led to his mental illness.

A graduate of the mining department of the Donetsk Polytechnical Institute, Nikitin got a job as a coal-mining engineer. In the opinion of the administration Nikitin lacked conscientiousness in performing his duties. In January 1970 he was demoted for having disobeyed the orders of the maintenance inspectors during an accident in the mine. He refused to take up the new job he was assigned. This led to a series of conflicts

which resulted in emotional derangement and development of paranoia. Nikitin separated from his wife, declaring that she was "an enemy of aristocratic descent, a landlord's daughter". He started sending petitions to the United Nations and other organisations. In these writings slander was interspersed with allegations that he was constantly persecuted and badgered.

In Koryagin's story Nikitin figures as a champion of the truth who was persecuted and confined to a psychiatric hospital without any medical grounds and without even being examined by a doctor. Koryagin who met Nikitin only once, on the 6th of September 1980, makes bold to state: "A.V. Nikitin is not suffering from any mental illness or personality affection; there is nothing about him to indicate that he has ever suffered from a mental illness or derangement. His confinement to psychiatric hospitals (in 1971 and 1977) should be regarded as absolutely uncalled for."

Koryagin's allegation is not merely biased. Koryagin did not take trouble to familiarise himself with the medical documents and the conclusions of a number of psychiatrists who had repeatedly examined and treated Nikitin. Neither is he knowledgeable about the effects of treatment administered to Nikitin. Koryagin simply fitted the data he wittingly distorted to the requisite conclusion and supplemented the "document" with slanderous political commentary. That the document trumped up by Koryagin suited those who staged the slanderous campaign about the punitive medicine in the USSR is corroborated by the fact that excerpts from Koryagin's writings have been in many instances reproduced by a number of newspapers in France, Great Britain, and the United States.

Koryagin resorts to falsification in a variety of cases, both significant and insignificant.

The list of persons, on whose illness Koryagin gambles in his own political interests, includes a certain A.A. Butko. Koryagin describes him as one of the many "unwilling patients", too. According to Koryagin, the reason for the "psychiatric persecution of Butko" was "his intention to emigrate". How did the matter stand in reality? A. Butko, a gynecologist, attracted the attention of psychiatrists at the end of 1971. Then in his early forties, he developed lupus erythematosus. He resorted to self-treatment which evidently led to the reduction of potency. He retired into himself, became irritable and conflicted with his family and his fellow-workers. He divorced from his second wife. It occurred to him that only the yogis could cure him and that he should go to India on foot. In the autumn of 1971 he took a leave and went to Batumi, a Black Sea port. There he took a boat and at night jumped overboard trying to swim to Turkey. Soon he lost his bearings and was carried away by the current in the direction of Poti. When he was rescued by the coastal guard, he told implausible versions about his intentions. This provoked suspicion regarding his soundness. The experts who examined Butko in the Republican Psychiatric Clinic of the Ministry of Health of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic diagnosed paranoid psychopathy accompanied by the megalomania. The diagnosis was later confirmed by a number of experts.

Of course, Koryagin's opinion might have differed from that of his colleagues. But in forming it he should have tried to be as objective as possible. He should have studied the anamnesis, the dynamics of the disease, the records of the patient's behaviour and treatment, the data provided by laboratory tests, etc.

Koryagin did not do this for the simple reason

that his purpose was to fit his "conclusions" into the pattern of lies about the "punitive medicine in the USSR".

The trial revealed many circumstances in the case which allowed to form an opinion of Koryagin's personality. It turned out that he trumped up his "medical" materials intending to use them to the detriment of his country's interests and reputation. It turned out that Koryagin had been writing and disseminating appeals aimed at undermining the political system in the Soviet Union for quite a long time. It was found out that Koryagin had acquired and kept in a special hiding-place a sawn-off gun intended for use in terrorist actions. Guns of this kind were used by the bandits and counter-revolutionaries in the 1920s.

But what caused the greatest indignation of the Soviet public was his participation in the ideological warfare against the USSR and the methods he resorted to in it.

These methods allowed Amnesty International to reiterate in its 1981 report the allegation that "the Soviet authorities continued (!) to confine dissenters in psychiatric hospitals for political rather than medical reasons".

In this case we are again confronted with the familiar technique of imparting a plausible appearance to misinformation by juggling the figures.

In his libel "Unwilling Patients" Koryagin mentioned twelve people whom he had never seen. It is only by hearsay that Koryagin could judge about there having been no grounds for their confinement to psychiatric hospital. After Koryagin had been convicted, his "open letter from prison" was circulated in the West. We shall not comment on the content and style of this "docu-

ment" typical of the forged materials fabricated by the experts in misinformation. Koryagin's name is used in connection with the sensational discovery: since 1977 the Soviet psychiatric hospitals have become the place of confinement of thousands of dissidents(!!).

Obviously, the word "thousands" was found to sound vague and not sufficiently impressive. It was decided to cite more "precise" figures. The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, for instance, referring to British sources, declared that "at least 7,800 (!!) Soviet citizens are confined to psychiatric hospitals each year, despite their being absolutely sound, because they are regarded as unsuitable subjects".

One of the leading Soviet psychiatrists A. Babayan, Chairman of the Permanent Commission on Psychiatry of the USSR Ministry of Health, once remarked that one can easily add any number of zeros to unsubstantiated figures without changing the message of a forged document.

As for Amnesty International, its 1981 report mentions a more modest figure: "Over 30 were forcibly confined in the psychiatric hospitals without genuine medical grounds."

As we see, the number of "victims of punitive medicine" varies from "thousands" to 7,800 and even 30. Figure-juggling is again resorted to so as to bolster a "fact" which cannot be corroborated otherwise.

An analysis of a great amount of materials enabled us to conclude that Amnesty International is an instrument in the hands of the sponsors of the crusade against the USSR, a crusade, which involves, among other things, a campaign based on the allegations about the abuse of medicine in the USSR for punitive purposes.

This conclusion is also corroborated by the activity of the expert in the psychological war-

fare against communism, the notorious sovietologist from Amnesty International, Peter Reddaway. It is significant that it was Peter Reddaway who provided a theoretical substantiation to the programme of the International Association Against the Abuse of Psychiatry for Political Reasons ("Association internationale contre l'utilisation politique de la psychiatrie"). When in December 1980 the plans to found this organisation were made public, *Le Monde* carried an article by Peter Reddaway, in which he stressed that "polite protests" against the abuse of psychiatry were "ineffective" and that more resolute actions should be taken.

In mid-1981, Peter Reddaway, in his article published by *The Observer* (that very newspaper which twenty years ago announced the foundation of Amnesty International), informed the British readers of the proposed "sanctions with respect to Soviet psychiatry".

As we see, Peter Reddaway and other officials from Amnesty International have their hand in every action fostering the campaign against "the abuse of medicine" and "political psychiatry" in the Soviet Union.

Those doctors, psychiatrists and soft-hearted philistines who, being more often than not inexperienced in dangerous political games, sign memoranda, resolutions and petitions appealing to help "the victims of Soviet psychiatry", are not aware of the true aims of the campaign they are dragged in. Peter Reddaway commented on this campaign saying that it is aimed at dealing "disastrous blows at the prestige and economic interests of the USSR".

Such are the aims of the "resolute actions" the authors of the big lie about the "punitive medicine" are reaching for.

Beware of the Emissaries of Lies!

Amnesty International does not usually indicate the number of copies of the materials it publishes.

This is not the case with the two leaflets I now have before me: "The Soviet Union. Criticism: a Crime? Political Prisoners in the Soviet Union" and "Persecution for Religious Reasons and Political Arrests in the Soviet Union" ("Religiose Verfolgung und Politische Inhaftierung in der Sowjetunion"). Both were published by the West German section of Amnesty International and both reveal that they were printed in Bonn in 1980 in 50,000 copies.

In these leaflets Amnesty International's traditional misinformation is condensed, as it were, and therefore looks especially defiant and provocative. A hundred thousand condensed doses of poison have been supplied to the market.

How many such doses does Amnesty International dispense? How much grist does Amnesty International annually supply to the mill of those who seek, by distorting the domestic and foreign policy of the Soviet Union, to undermine the ideas of detente and international co-operation and to encroach on the basic right of each person and each nation, the right to live in peace?

Does Amnesty International succeed in poisoning the people's minds with the misinformation about the Soviet Union it disseminates?

Something must sink into people's minds, some grains of falsehood must remain in their memory. This happens because the people living in other countries, being insufficiently informed about the true state of affairs in the Soviet Union, are not always able to instantaneously recognise

Amnesty International's materials as adulteration and falsehood.

This must account for the fact that Amnesty International sometimes succeeds in exerting its influence upon the people who are in no position to realise the true intentions of those who pull the strings in the shadow theatre located at 10, Southampton Street, London.

The duties of those who stage the performances in this theatre cover the selection of persons who, by acting as official heads of AI International Executive Committee, are expected to impart it a respectable and representative appearance.

We tend to believe that it is the special efforts of these "producers" that account for the fact that Jose Zalaquett, an emigre Chilean lawyer, acts as Chairperson of the nine-member International Executive Committee elected in 1980. Does he really believe all that is said in the introduction to Amnesty International's 1980 Report?

Suriya Wickremasinghe, a lawyer from Sri Lanka, officiates as Vice-Chairperson of the Committee. Ten years have passed since I last met her during her visit to the Soviet Union. She knew very little about the Soviet Union and almost nothing about its legal system. She did not evince any special interest in the matter either. What could have possibly prompted her to associate with Amnesty International?

It is hard to believe that Jose Zalaquett and Suriya Wickremasinghe whole-heartedly support Amnesty International's activities. They must have been confused by Amnesty International's publicity facade which conceals the dirty machinations involved in concocting and measuring out the poison of misinformation about the Soviet Union.

The misinformation is fabricated and circulated

by highly skilled professionals, who participate in various press conferences, symposia, meetings, and congresses held all over the world. These people, engaged in spreading the epidemics of misinformation, are in actual fact emissaries of lies.

Request to Readers

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 17, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.

Samuil Zivs is a prominent legal expert and public figure. He is a professor of law, Vice-President of the Association of Soviet Jurists, and an associate member of the International Academy of Comparative Law (the Hague). He has appeared on television in the United States (NBC) and Great Britain (BBC) as a participant in debates and discussions dealing with the question of human rights; he has given interviews which were widely covered by the media in France, Belgium, Sweden, the Federal Republic of Germany, and other countries. He has given lectures in universities and public auditoriums in many countries around the world.

Samuil Zivs's previous book, *HUMAN RIGHTS: Continuing the Discussion*, was translated by Progress Publishers into five languages and touched off a wide response from foreign readers.

This book tells about activities carried out by Amnesty International—an organisation which allegedly defends human rights; the facts Samuil Zivs cites in his book reveal its true nature.